



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A

872,541









THE

# DUBLIN REVIEW.

85108

---

VOL. IX. NEW SERIES.

---

61

JULY—OCTOBER,

MDCCCLXVII.

LONDON:


BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17, PORTMAN STREET,

AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

DERBY: RICHARDSON & SONS.

DUBLIN: JAMES DUFFY; W. B. KELLY.

AP  
4  
D82



WYMAN AND SONS,  
ORIENTAL, CLASSICAL, AND GENERAL PRINTERS,  
GREAT QUEEN STREET, W.C.



# CONTENTS.

---

## ART. I.—DR. PUSEY ON PAPAL PREROGATIVES.

Close connection of the argument for the Primacy with that for Ecclesiastical Unity . . . . .	1
Direct proof of the former doctrine . . . . .	3
The violent opposition of Dr. Pusey's Rule of Faith to Scripture and Antiquity . . . . .	5
Respective statement of the Episcopal and the Ultramontane theories on the centre of unity . . . . .	9
The latter theory is not contradicted, but on the contrary testified, by our Lord's words . . . . .	15
By Apostolic history . . . . .	18
By Ante-Nicene history . . . . .	21
By Post-Nicene history . . . . .	27
General comment on Dr. Pusey's objections . . . . .	29

---

## ART. II.—JOHN TETZEL.

Tetzel has been too little defended, even by Catholics . . . . .	35
His early career . . . . .	37
His sound doctrine on Indulgences . . . . .	39
Luther's Theses . . . . .	41
Tetzel's early insight into the heretical character of Luther's tenets . . . . .	43
He dies in profound melancholy . . . . .	45

---

## ART. III.—LORD PLUNKET'S LIFE AND SPEECHES.

Interesting character of the correspondence contained in these volumes . . . . .	48
Lord Plunket's birth and family . . . . .	49
His University career . . . . .	51
The Irish Parliament . . . . .	52
Plunket's early friendships . . . . .	55
Called to the Bar . . . . .	56

Enters Parliament . . . . .	57
His political opinions . . . . .	58
Effect of the Union on the Irish Bar . . . . .	59
Plunket's Anti-Union Speeches . . . . .	60
Speech on Emmett's trial . . . . .	62
Plunket Attorney-General . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Speeches on the Catholic Question . . . . .	63
Lord Brougham's opinion of his eloquence . . . . .	65
His Chancellorship . . . . .	66
His retirement and death . . . . .	69
Charges against Plunket's character . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Conduct of the Catholics regarding the Union . . . . .	71
Mr. Saurin's administration . . . . .	74
Administration of justice in Ireland . . . . .	75
Plunket's religious convictions . . . . .	76
His views of Catholic doctrine . . . . .	78
Admirable execution of Mr. Plunket's book . . . . .	79

---

#### ART. IV.—THE GODS OF THE NATIONS WHEN CHRIST CAME.

The imperial unity how advantageous to the Roman provinces . . . . .	80
Transition to the polytheistic idolatry . . . . .	81
Multiplicity of polytheism . . . . .	82
Its universality . . . . .	85
Its grasp on daily life . . . . .	87
Its influence on morals . . . . .	90
Relation of polytheism to civilization . . . . .	101
To the political constitution of the Empire . . . . .	102
To the natural feelings of the provinces . . . . .	103
To despotism and slavery . . . . .	104
Truth in the judgment-hall of Pilate . . . . .	106

---

#### ART. V.—ARCHBISHOP MANNING ON ENGLAND AND CHRISTENDOM.

The Archbishop's most large views on the piety and salvability of non-Catholics . . . . .	112
The first of his Essays analyzed . . . . .	113
The second . . . . .	116
The third . . . . .	117
The fourth . . . . .	121
The Introduction . . . . .	123
His character as a champion of the Church . . . . .	125

**ART. VI.—S. JANE FRANCES DE CHANTAL.**

Introduction . . . . .	125
The Saint's father, M. Frémyot . . . . .	127
Her marriage . . . . .	132
Her first miracle . . . . .	133
Her husband's death . . . . .	134
Her first meeting with S. Francis of Sales . . . . .	136
S. Francis's treatise on the love of God . . . . .	141
S. Teresa's and S. Jane Frances's respective vows . . . . .	142
Tender friendship with S. Francis of Sales . . . . .	146
Her long anguish and her death . . . . .	149
Vision witnessed by S. Vincent of Paul . . . . .	150
The order of the Visitation . . . . .	151

---

**ART. VII.—F. RYDER AND DR. WARD.**

Momentousness of the point at issue . . . . .	154
Largeness of F. Ryder's theory . . . . .	156
Objections to it . . . . .	157
The question of conciliating Protestants . . . . .	160
Matters hereafter to be treated . . . . .	161

---

**ART. VIII.—THE HOLY SEE AND THE SPANISH INQUISITION.**

January article on the Inquisition . . . . .	163
Condition of Spain at close of the fifteenth century . . . . .	164
First impulse to establishment of the Spanish Inquisition . . . . .	169
The Pope deceived as to the King's intentions . . . . .	171
He consequently issues a Brief . . . . .	173
The King pretends submission . . . . .	175
Rome makes unavailing attempts to mitigate the rigour of the Spanish Inquisition . . . . .	178
Measures against the Jews . . . . .	179
Ferdinand and Isabella's dealing with the Moors . . . . .	182
Ximenes becomes Grand Inquisitor of Castile and Leon . . . . .	187
Except under Ximenes, the aim of the Inquisition was to lessen the influence of Rome in Spain. . . . .	190

**ART. IX.—IRISH QUESTIONS.**

Present state of Ireland . . . . .	200
Irish questions in Parliament . . . . .	201
Primary importance of the Tenure question . . . . .	203
Tendencies of English opinion on Irish affairs . . . . .	204
Lord Dufferin's views . . . . .	205
Danger of delaying beneficial legislation . . . . .	206

**X.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.**

The Civiltà Cattolica, June 15, 1867 . . . . .	208
F. Riess, S. J., on the Encyclical of Dec. 8, 1864 . . . . .	210
F. Knox, of the Oratory, on the Infallibility of the Church . . . . .	213
Rev. Dr. Murray's Prose and Verse . . . . .	214
Christian Schools and Scholars . . . . .	217
Mr. Healy Thompson's Library of Religious Biography . . . . .	219
Mr. Ffoulkes's Christendom's Divisions. . . . .	221
F. Faber on Devotion to the Pope. . . . .	230
Lives of the Fathers of the Desert . . . . .	231
F. Sweeny's Lectures . . . . .	232
Doctor Hettinger's Apologie des Christenthum . . . . .	234
A Few Hints to Exeter Hall . . . . .	237
Tracts for the Day. . . . .	239
Irish Homes and Irish Hearts . . . . .	239
Charge of Chief Justice Cockburn . . . . .	241

**XI.—CORRESPONDENCE.**

# CONTENTS.

---

## ART. I.—SPIRITISM AND MODERN DEVIL-WORSHIP.

Existence, power, and malignity of evil spirits . . . . .	253
Guardian angels . . . . .	260
Scriptural doctrine on evil spirits . . . . .	262
Devil-worship of this day . . . . .	266
Phenomena of spiritism . . . . .	268
Are the alleged facts true? . . . . .	272
Are they produced by evil spirits? . . . . .	274
Conclusion . . . . .	278

---

## ART. II.—DR. PUSEY ON THE SYLLABUS.

State of our controversy with Dr. Pusey . . . . .	280
Dr. Pusey did not assail the DUBLIN REVIEW, but Pius IX. . . . .	282
Dr. Pusey's first main proposition on the extent of infallibility claimed by Pius IX. . . . .	283
His second main proposition . . . . .	285
Marks of an <i>ex cathedrâ</i> utterance . . . . .	289
Does Pius IX. extend infallibility more widely than Bellarmine? . . . . .	290
Examination of Dr. Pusey's historical objections . . . . .	295
Dr. Pusey's strange complaint on the large number of utterances for which infallibility is claimed . . . . .	300

---

## ART. III.—LIFE OF S. ALOYSIUS.

Attractiveness of Mr. Thompson's volume . . . . .	301
Extraordinary variety in the unity of saintliness . . . . .	301
Without study of the Saints Christ is little known . . . . .	303
S. Aloysius . . . . .	305



Saint-worship our only sure protection against idolatry . . . . .	315
Christianity, which brought in the doctrine of the Incarnation, brought in also that of creation . . . . .	319
Creaturely perfection in humility . . . . .	322
The Mother of God . . . . .	323
Both her greatness and her Son's were veiled during His mortal life .	327

---

#### ART. IV.—MINOR DOCTRINAL JUDGMENTS.

The absolute necessity of treating on the authority due to doctrinal Encyclicals, &c. . . . .	333
F. Ryder's position . . . . .	337
The Church infallible in minor censures . . . . .	339
Scope of these minor censures . . . . .	344
How far are censured propositions certainly untrue? . . . . .	346
Minor doctrinal judgments . . . . .	348
These are often affirmatively expressed . . . . .	348
Object-matter of infallibility . . . . .	350
The Church infallible primarily in her magisterium . . . . .	360
The minimistic tenet more probably "heretical" . . . . .	365
Defence of an argument adduced in the DUBLIN REVIEW of January last . . . . .	367
The question of mortal sin . . . . .	369
The <i>Tablet</i> on a sentence in the "Quantâ curâ" . . . . .	375

---

#### ART. V.—ENGLISH CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

Divorce of education and religion . . . . .	381
Office of mothers and sisters in the work of education . . . . .	386
Position of Catholics of the leisured class under the present circum- stances of England . . . . .	390
Conduct of the English aristocracy . . . . .	395
Very serious responsibility of the English Catholic gentry . . . . .	398
Our existing Colleges supply no adequate means for meeting that re- sponsibility . . . . .	401
Yet some Catholics have greatly overrated the benefits obtainable from Oxford and Cambridge . . . . .	406
Oxford as an introduction into society . . . . .	407
Oxford as a preparation for public life . . . . .	409
Oxford as a seat of intellectual training . . . . .	412
Oxford as a seat of religious influence . . . . .	417
Shocking immorality of Oxford life . . . . .	424
Objection considered, "What is urged against Oxford may be equally urged against the professions" . . . . .	428
Objection considered, "Catholics may convert Oxford" . . . . .	430

## *Contents.*

iii

Yet Oxford possesses certain real advantages . . . . .	432
Summary of evils which must follow from the education of Catholics at Oxford . . . . .	434
Existing elements for an English Catholic University . . . . .	437

---

### ART. VI.—THE FIRST AND SECOND MAN.

Polytheistic idolatry a proof of the Fall . . . . .	441
The state of Original Justice . . . . .	442
Position into which Adam and his race fell . . . . .	446
Counterpart of Adam in the new creation . . . . .	451
Christ's work in the Church . . . . .	455
Body of the second Adam . . . . .	459
Perpetuity of that body . . . . .	465

---

### ART. VII.—THE CENTENARY OF 1867.

Extraordinary attendance of Bishops . . . . .	473
Reception of the secular clergy . . . . .	474
St. Peter's on the morning of the canonization . . . . .	475
Ceremonies of the canonization . . . . .	477
The Pope's Sermon . . . . .	479

---

### ART. VIII.—F. RYDER'S THEOLOGICAL CITATIONS.

Antecedent improbability that any Catholic theologians should hold what F. Ryder supposes . . . . .	483
F. Ryder's alleged testimonies from Suarez, the Salmanticenses, Tanner, the Acts of Ratisbon, Bolgeni, Stapleton, Diredo . . . . .	486
F. Ryder's notes A. and B. . . . .	492
General comment on those Ultramontanes who have written with a special view to Gallicanism . . . . .	492
Ballerini's alleged testimony . . . . .	498
Cappellari's alleged testimony . . . . .	500
Gregory XVI.'s testimony . . . . .	507
F. Perrone's doctrine . . . . .	509

---

### ART. IX.—AN IRISH SESSION.

Prospects of the next Session . . . . .	512
Lord Russell's antecedents on the Church Question . . . . .	513
Mr. Gladstone's position . . . . .	515
Plans of dealing with the Establishment . . . . .	515

Mr. Aubrey de Vere's pamphlets . . . . .	516
Natural order of dealing with Irish Questions . . . . .	517
The Land Question . . . . .	518
The Catholic University . . . . .	522
The Ecclesiastical Titles Act . . . . .	524
The Workhouse and Prison Question . . . . .	525
Reform of the Irish representation . . . . .	525

X.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Episcopal Address to the Holy Father . . . . .	528
Letter from the Holy Office on Heathen Classics . . . . .	533
The Revue des Questions Historiques on Galileo . . . . .	535
Mgr. Roskovany's Romanus Pontifex . . . . .	537
Cav. de Rossi's Bulletino di Archeologia Cristiana . . . . .	539
Mr. Hozier's Seven Weeks' War . . . . .	543



THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

JULY, 1867.

---

ART. I.—DR. PUSEY ON PAPAL PREROGATIVES.

*An Eirenicon.* By E. B. PUSEY, D.D. London: Parker.

*Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church.* By T. W. ALLIES, M.A. London: Longmans.

*Tractatus de Ecclesiâ Christi.* Auctore Patricio MURRAY. Dublin: M'Glashan.

*Clementis Schrader de Unitate Romanâ.* Vienna: Mayer & Co.

THE scriptural and patristic argument for Papal Prerogatives is so overwhelming and irresistible, that the insensibility of Anglicans to its force is at first sight one of the most amazing facts in the whole world. It would be a great mistake, however, to suppose that this insensibility proceeds chiefly from any intellectual cause whatever. To a thinker like Dr. Pusey, various doctrines practically taught by Rome are so very distasteful,—and the very supposition of his being simply external to the Visible Church is so absolutely intolerable,—that arguments have no access to his mind. We may add that even were his prejudices far less violent than they are, his is not the structure of intellect which would appreciate a chain of reasoning, be its force ever so solid and unanswerable.

Putting aside, however, personal considerations, with which we are but indirectly concerned, there is one very serious argumentative fault which has considerable share in blinding an Anglican's perception. The two questions of Papal Primacy and Ecclesiastical Unity are indissolubly connected with each other; so that the latter doctrine is of prominent importance as a means of establishing the former: whereas Anglicans persist in perversely separating the two. It was for this reason that in January we prefaced our argument on the question now before us, by a careful consideration of that other logically preliminary subject. Anglicans and Catholics are of course agreed in the fundamental proposition, that Christianity came from God. This then being assumed, there is no thesis in

the world which (on historical grounds) is more irresistibly certain, than that the Christian religion, according to God's immutable appointment, was to be identified in every age with one corporate society. This was part of our conclusion in January. But if so much as this be granted, then a further thesis follows no less irresistibly; viz. that the Church in communion with Rome is in every age that one corporate society, which Christ appointed to be the infallible expositor of His religion: and this was the remaining part of our January conclusion. Lastly, from this thesis a third thesis follows no less irresistibly and even more self-evidently; viz. that God invested the Pope with all those prerogatives which Roman Catholics ascribe to him. It is this third thesis which is to occupy us on the present occasion. Let us first then see where we were landed in January; and let us pursue our argument from the point where we then left it.

Our argument on the whole then, we said, is this. The Apostolic Church was constituted by Christ as one corporate and hierarchical society: claiming to teach with infallible authority the truths committed by Him to her charge; and inculcating them on all her members, through her various living organs and representatives. Moreover, the Apostles' death was not, by God's appointment, to make any change whatever in her organization. On the contrary, Christ and His Apostles had expressly declared that she was to remain on earth until His second coming. Correlatively with this broad fact on the one hand, there stands forth in history a broad fact on the other hand. From that time to the present, there has always been one, and (speaking generally) there has never been more than one society, precisely answering to the description which we have given. This society, therefore, in every age has been the One Catholic Apostolic Church. There have been rare and exceptional periods, we admit—specially the period of that schism which terminated at the Council of Constance—when there were two rival claimants of Apostolic privilege. But the fact that at rare intervals there have been rival claims, does not tend ever so remotely to cause doubt in ordinary times, when there is no such rivalry. The Apostolical Church, such as we have described it, was to last till the end of the world. In the time of S. Irenæus there was one, and one only, such society. In the time of Constantine there was one, and one only, such society. In the time of S. Gregory—in the Middle Ages—at the time of the Reformation—there was one, and one only, such society. At the present moment there is one, and one only, such society. Hence she is the One Catholic Apostolic Church: and her teaching, whatever it may be, is infallibly true; simply because it is her teaching.\*

---

\* Certain Unionists seem to think that the "Greek Church" forms an exception to our remark made in the above extract, that the Roman Catholic Church alone can possibly be the Apostolic. We had already pointed out, however, in the same article (p. 96), that the Greek Church does not even put



We should further add that this society has ever preserved an identity of name: an identity which both symbolizes and confirms its identity of essence. From the very days of S. Ignatius Martyr, says F. Schrader (vol. i. p. 2), the name of "Catholic" has prevailed as intrinsic and peculiar to the One True Church, and as distinguishing her from all other societies.

Here then at once arises our obvious and irresistible demonstration of Papal prerogatives. The Church in communion with Rome has ever been the One Catholic Church; and whatever is taught at any period by the One Catholic Church is infallibly true. These two propositions were established in our January number. But Dr. Pusey will himself admit that the Church in communion with Rome has in these later centuries uniformly taught that very Papal doctrine, which he denies as false and denounces as tyrannical. Since, therefore, she teaches Papal doctrine,—and since *all* her doctrine is infallibly true,—her Papal doctrine inclusively enjoys that privilege. It is infallibly true, as the Council of Florence decreed, that the Roman Pontiff is Christ's true Vice-gerent; that he is father and teacher of all Christians; that he possesses full power of feeding, ruling, and guiding the Universal Church;

---

forth a *claim* to the gift of infallibility. These words have since then received support from an unexpected quarter. The *Union Review* of March (pp. 189–197) publishes certain so-called "principles of Catholic orthodoxy, by a member of the holy Eastern Church," followed by a letter from the same member of that schismatical communion. This writer maintains (p. 192) that "both the English and Roman Churches lie under the material interdict and anathema of the Church Universal," because of their retaining the "Filioque." There cannot be a graver ecclesiastical charge; and we ask at once on what ground the author bases it. The position which he assumes is very remarkable. He does not allege any Divine promise whatever that the whole body of patriarchs—or, again, the great majority of bishops throughout the world—may not fall into the very error which he ascribes to the Pope; though of course he thinks that if they did fall into it, they would ipso facto fall away from the Body of Christ. Neither, again, does he ever so distantly profess that any infallible authority whatever condemned this (supposed) error when it arose, and pronounced its maintainers external to the Church. His whole attack rests on *his own* interpretation of Antiquity and of the Ecumenical Councils.

We should add that the letter is interesting and most temperately written; and that the doctrinal question of the "Filioque" is one which a Catholic controversialist is bound to consider. We are not without hope that on some future occasion we may offer to our readers a treatment of the whole subject; but we may mention meanwhile, that nowhere have we seen a more complete and exhaustive defence of the Roman Catholic Church on this matter, than in the debates of Florence. The Greek orators were silenced by their opponents; and indeed all, except Mark of Ephesus, converted by them.

that his See possesses primacy over the whole world.\* It is infallibly true, as the Council of Trent affirmed (sess. 14, c. 7), that "to him has been delivered supreme power in the Universal Church." It is part of the Roman Catholic Faith and therefore infallibly true, to use Bossuet's words, that he has been commissioned by God "to guide *all the flock* along His paths"; and, as "the common centre of all Catholic unity," whether in the matter of teaching or of government.† It is further infallibly certain that he has power, in what he may consider extreme cases, to withdraw all ecclesiastical jurisdiction from this or that individual bishop, not in punishment of any canonical offence, but in order to the Church's general good. This, we say, is infallibly certain: for Pius VII. exercised this very power in the year 1801 over a considerable number of French bishops; and all the Roman Catholic bishops throughout the world taught that whoever disobeyed his decree became thereby schismatical.‡ But there can be no reason for proceeding further at this early stage in our enumeration of those prerogatives, which all Roman Catholics ascribe to the Holy Father, and which Dr. Pusey denies to him.

Our direct historical argument against Dr. Pusey is therefore completed at starting. The main business of our article is to answer Dr. Pusey's objections—not, be it observed, against the reasoning which *establishes* our conclusion—but only against that conclusion itself. He falls back on his favourite authority, the first five centuries; and he alleges that a doctrine directly contradictory to the Papal prevailed during that period. We have already pointed out more than once, that if his reasoning were really cogent, the inevitable conclusion must be one which he is extremely far from desiring. Dr. Pusey, we have said, does not attempt to controvert the Catholic *argument*; but applies himself to a denial of the Catholic *conclusion*. Let us suppose for a moment that his reasoning in this direction were completely successful. Catholic controversialists maintain—and Dr. Pusey does not even notice their arguments—that if Christianity came from God, the Church in communion with Rome

\* In April, 1866 (pp. 504-537), we showed how extremely strong is the Florentine doctrine on Papal prerogatives.

† See the passage quoted from Bossuet, in our number for last October, p. 537.

‡ It may be worth while to quote a few words from Pius VII.'s Apostolic Letter on the occasion:—"Derogamus expressè cuicunque assensui legitimorum archiepiscoporum, episcoporum et capitulorum respectivarum ecclesiarum ac aliorum quorumlibet ordinariarum: et *perpetuò interdicimus iisdem quodcunque exercitium cujuscunque ecclesiasticæ jurisdictionis*; nullius roboris declarantes quidquid quispiam eorum sit attentaturus."

is infallible. Dr. Pusey professes to establish a further conclusion; viz. that this very Church has in late centuries fallen into error. If, then, you unite that proposition which he labours to establish, with that other proposition which he does not attempt to controvert, you are landed in the conclusion that Christianity did not come from God. We are therefore occupied in defending the Divine origin of Christianity against Dr. Pusey's earnest (though most unintentional) assault.

Before entering on our reply to Dr. Pusey's various objections, we must begin with an introductory remark. On many matters Dr. Pusey makes more or less approach to the doctrine of Scripture and Antiquity: on some it may even be said that he coincides with that doctrine. But on the Church's office (1) in teaching, and (2) in governing, not even Mr. Martineau or Mr. Spurgeon is more widely at variance than he, from that standard to which he appeals. We insisted on this in January; and we will here briefly refer to what we there established.

Let us first then consider the Church of the Apostles: let us inquire what were the means appointed by God at that time, for a Christian to learn the doctrines of his religion. He obtained this important knowledge by repeated acts of intellectual captivity; by humbly submitting his intellect to the doctrinal instruction given by the authorized superiors of his local Church; by regulating his interior life according to the rules and counsels placed before him; by uniting himself heartily with the spirit of that large practical and devotional system which surrounded him; in one word, by unreservedly surrendering himself to the new moral and spiritual atmosphere which he had begun to breathe. And his security against being led astray by all this, was the gift of infallibility which the Apostles had received, and by the light of which they directed their various local Churches. All this is so very obvious on the surface of the New Testament, that we believe no Scripture-reading Protestant will dream of denying it. He will say indeed that, when the Apostles died and inspiration ceased, the Rule of Faith by necessity was essentially and fundamentally changed; and to this allegation we replied in January. But Dr. Pusey himself will be foremost in maintaining, that the death of the Apostles made no change in the Rule of Faith.

In fact, on passing to the post-Apostolic period we find the same Rule universally prevailing. Individuals still learned the Faith in the old way and in no other; viz. by submitting themselves with simplest docility to the instruction of their local superiors, and by surrendering themselves to the doctrinal atmosphere with which they were surrounded. In this period

again, just as in the Apostolic, their security against being led into error by such unquestioning submission, was the infallibility,—not indeed now of the Apostles—but of the existing *Ecclesia Docens*. Of course this Rule of Faith, like every other earthly thing, had its disadvantages; the Antiochenes e.g., under Paul Samosatene and under Nestorius, were exposed to much doctrinal peril; though far less than might at first sight appear.\* But the most orthodox and clear-sighted among them knew only of two securities for protection against this peril: on the one hand, they adhered most firmly to those lessons which they had been taught from their childhood upwards; on the other hand, they earnestly invoked the Church's supreme authority, for aid against the corrupting influence of their local superior. But would they pursue such a course as Dr. Pusey recommends? would they think of deserting their traditional doctrine—of opposing the prescription of supreme ecclesiastical authority—in deference to their own private interpretation of the Nicene or the Constantinopolitan decrees? They would have regarded such a course as being purely and simply rebellion against God, apostasy from Christ. The one authority to which they looked was the Church's practical teaching. Such was the principle accepted by all, and blended with their very first springs of thought.

Now we say that Mr. Martineau or Mr. Spurgeon does not differ more widely from this Rule of Faith, than does Dr. Pusey. Consider, e.g., his demeanour to Roman Catholics; whom he considers to be as truly members of the Church, as were the Antiochenes of the fifth century. In effect he addresses them thus: "You have been trained from childhood by your teachers, " you have been earnestly encouraged by your highest eccle- " siastical authorities, in a certain most mischievous system; " which I beseech you to abandon. Appeal, I entreat you, " from the practical teaching of Pope and bishops, to your " Church's definitions of faith, and especially to the decrees of " Trent. In those decrees you will find no kind of sanction for " that system, which your authorities have taught you, and " which has been, in truth, the mere invention of indivi-

---

\* "Far less than might at first sight appear;" because ordinary Catholics imbibe their Faith much more from the circumambient doctrinal atmosphere, than from direct doctrinal statements. A *succession* of Pauls or Nestoriuses would doubtless have rendered that atmosphere pestilential; but it is precisely this, against which the Church's infallible intervention securely guards her children. And so say the very Oxford Tracts. Vincent Lirinensis "considers the Church to possess within it that principle of health and vigour which *expels heresies out of its system*." See the words quoted by us in January 1866, p. 209.

“ duals. This practical system — especially in what concerns its one most prominent feature — overthrows your trust in Christ; ruins true spirituality; and verges closely on idolatry.” Now let us suppose that some individual had addressed such language as this, to any section whatever of the early Catholics. It is very certain that they would have regarded their self-elected monitor with disgust and horror, as soliciting them to heresy and apostasy.

No one can wonder that, so long as Dr. Pusey's opinions on the very foundation of Church-doctrine are thus violently anti-scriptural, thus violently anti-patristic,—he should be stone-blind to the historical evidence for Papal prerogatives. In our own argument we shall of course assume, that God appointed that Rule of Faith, which both Scripture and Tradition on their very surface so unanimously, so prominently, so emphatically testify.

It is most certain then, that when Nestorius or any other bishop fell into heresy, some divinely appointed authority was at hand promptly to redress the evil. And we use this word “promptly” for a special reason. In some places Dr. Pusey seems to hold that each bishop is by divine right supreme in his own diocese, and subjected by God to no higher tribunal on earth; whereas elsewhere he speaks as though a bishop were placed by God under the jurisdiction of an Ecumenical Council. Here, of course, is but one of the strange mutual contradictions which abound in the *Eirenicon*. Yet we will do Dr. Pusey the justice to admit, that this particular contradiction is by no means as great as at first sight appears; for such an authority over bishops as he recognizes, has long been practically equivalent to none at all. “An Ecumenical Council is supreme over bishops.” Yes: but on Dr. Pusey's view, God has made no provision whatever for the summoning of such a Council, or of otherwise collecting episcopal suffrages; however frightful the dangers with which dogma is threatened. For more than eleven centuries, according to him, the Church's supreme authority has been in abeyance; and during this abeyance what provision has God made for purity of doctrine? One “branch” of the Church has been permitted to inculcate most earnestly a devotion closely verging on the idolatrous; nay, to enforce as actually of faith a tenet directly contradictory to God's Revelation: while another “branch” has permitted errors to prevail most widely within her bosom, which are worse than Mahometanism itself.\* And

---

\* See Dr. Pusey's letter quoted in our last number, p. 523.



yet, forsooth, God has appointed some power in the Church, sufficient to guard her against doctrinal corruption !

Such a notion has, of course, been already refuted in our article of January. In carrying on our argument indeed from that article, we must not forget that we are here reasoning “*ad hominem*” against Dr. Pusey’s objections ; and that we must confine our view therefore to those earlier centuries, which he himself regards as authoritative. This therefore is to be understood throughout, that we are arguing from no other data than those supplied by Dr. Pusey’s golden age ; yet those data, as we showed in January, abundantly evidence two all-important conclusions, which may stand as the basis of our present reasoning. (1) Christ established a certain infallible oracle, for the very purpose of securing purity of doctrine within the Church ; an oracle which should not go to sleep for centuries, but which, on the contrary, was to be available whenever its utterances might be required. (2) The authority thus infallible in teaching was to be no other than that which was to be supreme also in governing. These two conclusions then we here assume. We assume that a certain authority is placed over the whole Church, infallible in teaching, supreme in governing, available in case of need ; and we now proceed to inquire *what* precisely that authority is. And this inquiry again was *partially* answered in our January article ; for that authority, beyond all doubt, was the Apostolate at first and the Catholic Episcopate afterwards. But then this statement conveys no definite meaning, until it has been further explained. Suppose it were said that the House of Commons possesses this or that prerogative : there is no meaning in such a statement, unless there is first some understanding as to what are to be accounted *decrees* of the House of Commons. It might imaginably be the constitution of that House, that no decrees are considered to possess its authority unless two-thirds of the members present have assented ; or the majority of all its members present and absent ; or the majority of county members, and also separately the majority of borough members. All the world knows how cardinal a question it was in the first French Revolution, whether the States-General were to vote in one body or separately by orders : again and again it happened, that measures were passed by the former method which would have been promptly rejected by the latter. When you say, therefore, that God has invested the Catholic Episcopate with a power of teaching and ruling,—you have said nothing definite, until you further explain *how* the said Episcopate is to put out its voice. You must explain whether you mean, that God has given to a

*majority* of bishops a power of binding the minority; or that He has given, e.g., supreme power to a majority of the *patriarchs*; or, in fact, what you *do* consider the divinely appointed method of episcopal corporate action.

Nay, there is a still further question which requires an answer. Every one knows who are the members of the House of Commons; every one knew who were members of the States-General: but who are the Catholic bishops? Of all the corporate ecclesiastical societies which exist at any given moment, what mark of identification has been given by God, that men may know *which* is the Catholic Church?

The first teachers and governors of the Church, however, were not the bishops but the Apostles. In regard to these, very much less remains to be decided. God appointed them individually, and made known such appointment to the others. Moreover, as regards their office of *teaching* the Church, each was separately infallible. Still, as regards their power of *government*, a question has to be asked concerning *them*, similar to that asked concerning the bishops who succeeded them. Did God infallibly secure the *mutual agreement* of the Apostles in all their disciplinary decrees? or did He give to a majority power to bind the minority? or did He give to the Apostolate some different constitution altogether?

And here you see what theologians mean, when they speak about the "centre" or "principle" of unity in the Church. Having established that the Church possesses corporate unity essentially and indefectibly, they proceed to inquire what is the centre or principle of that unity: this is the exact point which we are now considering.

To fix our ideas then more definitely, let us for a moment assume that hypothesis, which will most readily occur to an Englishman; let us suppose that God vested the supreme rule of His Church in the *majority* of those appointed by Him as her rulers. Let us express in detail the Church's constitution on such an hypothesis. However strange the theory we are going to draw out, every particular in it would be quite consistent with our conclusions of January, so far as those conclusions are based on data of the early centuries.

"On every matter of discipline a majority of the Apostles  
 "bound the minority; and each Apostle, being infallibly  
 "secured against mortal sin, was infallibly secured against  
 "refusing due obedience and originating schism. So long as  
 "they lived, the Catholic Church was that corporate society  
 "which they governed by majorities: during the years when  
 "S. John survived the other Apostles, he governed that Church  
 "with absolute authority: when he died, that was the Catholic

“ Church, which had been governed by him up to the moment  
 “ of his death. From that moment the bishops of that society,  
 “ deciding by a majority of their number, are infallible in  
 “ teaching and supreme in governing. One of them, indeed,  
 “ has the prerogative, when any urgency exists, of collecting  
 “ the bishops into a representative assembly, or of taking  
 “ their separate votes ; and God, by His Providence, ever  
 “ secures that, when the Church is threatened with doctrinal  
 “ disaster, due action shall be invariably taken.\* On every  
 “ such occasion the majority of votes decides the point at  
 “ issue : in matters of discipline it demands universal obe-  
 “ dience ; in matters of doctrine it is infallible ; in matters of  
 “ dogma strictly so called, i. e., in defining this or that  
 “ portion of the Deposit, its decisions bind under pain of  
 “ heresy. If any bishop—of Rome or any other—refuses ac-  
 “ ceptance of a dogmatic definition, he ceases ipso facto to  
 “ be a Catholic ; and the majority can either appoint another  
 “ bishop in his place, or suppress the particular See altogether.  
 “ This has been the constitution appointed by God for the  
 “ Church since the Apostles died ; the majority of bishops, and  
 “ not any particular bishop, having been ordained by Him to  
 “ be the principle of unity.”

We need not say that no human being ever held this strange farrago. But its methodical exhibition will, we hope, vividly set forth, what are those questions which remain to be decided from the history of early Christianity, after our conclusions of last January have obtained acceptance. There are, of course, other imaginable non-Catholic views ; as, e. g., that the majority of *patriarchs*, or some other patriarch than that of Rome, is the principle of unity. But all these are (if possible) even more void of substance and of colourable foundation than the theory drawn out above. We will throughout, therefore, treat this theory as the anti-Catholic alternative ; and we may name it “ the episcopal theory.”

Among Roman Catholics, as is well known, there are two different schools,—the Ultramontane and the Gallican ; and our next step, therefore, should be to state systematically the Gallican theory. But we must profess ourselves unable to do so. Gallican theologians, it seems to us, are very far more given to attacking Ultramontane doctrine, than to expressing and vindicating their own ; and we are honestly unable to

---

\* S such supposition as this must be necessarily inserted, in order to  
 t Dr. Pusey's strange conception, of a supreme authority which  
 'or centuries.

understand what their own is. They all agree (see, e. g., our quotation from Bossuet, p. 4) in representing the Holy See as the divinely-appointed centre of unity; and we have never been able to understand how this harmonizes with their other propositions.

First as to Apostolic times. Do they consider that in matters of discipline S. Peter was subject to a majority of the Apostles? Such a conclusion seems to follow, from their tenet that an Ecumenical Council has authority over the Pope; yet we never happened to meet with a Gallican controversialist who has fairly stated it. Let us assume it, however, to be the Gallican tenet. We ask then, how such a tenet can be reconciled with the doctrine, that S. Peter was the centre of Apostolic unity. We cannot understand what is *meant* by this latter doctrine, if the Church could possibly act *against* S. Peter's determination in her united and corporate capacity. If S. Peter were subject to a majority of the Apostles, not S. Peter, but that majority, would be the Church's principle of unity.

We move on to the post-Apostolic period. In this period, according to Gallicans, God still established S. Peter's See as the Church's centre of unity. Let us suppose, then, certain thinkers to be excommunicated by that See as heretics.\* Since that See is the centre of Catholic unity, those whom the Pope avowedly *excludes* from Catholic unity, are at once removed by God from the Visible Church; unless indeed they were external to her already. This must be held no less by a Gallican than by an Ultramontane. Yet the former maintains that the Pope's judgment is not infallible; but that, on the contrary, the tenet held by these men may possibly be the very truth of Revelation. According to the Gallicans then, a number of men may be removed by God from the Visible Church for no other fault, than that of holding the very Truth which God has revealed. The Gallican maintains—no one more earnestly—that the Visible Church is founded on profession of the One Faith; and yet, if he is to carry out consistently his characteristic tenet, he must admit that men may be banished by God from that Church for no other offence, than the professing that Faith in its purity and integrity.†

---

\* No one will deny, we suppose, that the Pope often *does* excommunicate heretics without waiting for the concurrence of other bishops. Take, e. g., the Pope's last definition of faith: "Si qui secus ac a nobis definitum est præsumpserint corde sentire, ii noverint . . . se naufragium circa fidem passos esse, et *ab unitate Ecclesiæ defecisse*."

† All Gallicans deny the Pope's infallibility in *definitions of faith*; and we have argued, therefore, against them on that ground. The argument

It would be easy to multiply similar instances of self-contradiction, into which consistent Gallicans must inevitably fall. But there is no need for doing so : because we are not here writing against Gallicanism ; and because we have said enough to justify us in assuming the Ultramontane doctrine, as alone genuinely representing Roman Catholicism. In fact, without any injury to our argument, we might have ignored Gallicanism altogether. We conclusively refute Dr. Pusey, if we show that even against Ultramontanism his objections are worthless.

Yet we must not fail, in passing, to vindicate Gallicanism against Dr. Pusey's withering advocacy ; an advocacy which must be more unwelcome to Gallicans than even to ourselves. Dr. Pusey writes constantly under an impression, that Gallican tenets stand at least halfway between his own and Ultramontanism. But in truth it is hardly too much to say under present circumstances, that their practical difference from the latter is imperceptible and evanescent, while they are separated from Dr. Pusey by a gulf impassable and unfathomable. Gallicans profess no doubt, in theory, that the Pope is subject to an Ecumenical Council ; but while no such Council is sitting, they hold, as strongly as any Ultramontane, the unreserved obedience due from each bishop to the Pope. When, in the instance already mentioned, Pius VII. deposed so many French bishops, whoever resisted this exercise of authority was regarded, not as a Gallican, but as a schismatic. And as to the matter of ecclesiastical *teaching*, the contrast between Gallicans and Dr. Pusey is still more striking and violent. It is Dr. Pusey's position, that for the last eleven centuries the Church has exercised no power of infallibly condemning newly arisen error.\* But according to Gallicans, the exercise of this power has been most active and unintermittent : having been displayed indeed on the largest scale only two years ago ; viz., so soon as the "*Quantâ curâ*," with its appended Syllabus, had been tacitly accepted by the Catholic Episcopate.

Having drawn out then, a few pages back, what we called the "episcopal" theory, we are now to draw out the Papal : we are to explain, from the Ultramontane standpoint, what is that principle of organic unity which binds the Church to-

---

in the text would be by no means equally conclusive against any supposition (which for ourselves, of course, we utterly repudiate) that the Pope is not infallible in pronouncing *minor* censures without tacit assent of the Episcopate.

\* See, for instance, *Eirenicon*, p. 84. "I see not what this question as to the present ability of the Church to meet fresh errors which may emerge, has to do with the question as to the infallible certainty of the truths which the whole Church in common has received."

gether ; by what means, under what circumstances, the Church is capable of united and corporate action. We beg our readers to look back at the "episcopal" theory as we presented it above, in order that they may compare it point by point with that Papal theory which we are now to exhibit. The following then is the scheme for which Ultramontanes contend.

The Apostles *taught* the Church, as being each separately an infallible and universal teacher : but they *ruled* the Church *collectively*, and not separately ; ruled her in virtue of their union with S. Peter. On every matter of discipline where there was opening for difference of opinion, his deliberate decision determined that of the rest, and constituted the Church's Law. The command, e. g. (Acts xv. 29) to abstain from idolothyta and from blood, derived its binding force from the fact, not that the Apostolic *majority*, but that *S. Peter* approved it. Of the prerogatives exercised by individual Apostles, some had a divine, others an ecclesiastical origin : the former were known as such by each Apostle through his infallibility ; the latter were possessed by him in virtue of S. Peter's concurrence. When S. Peter died, his successor became the centre of ecclesiastical unity. All those, and only those, are Catholics, who are in his communion. The Catholic Episcopate teaches and rules the Catholic Church ; but it does so only in union with S. Peter's Chair. Any doctrinal decision of Catholic bishops, which has his express or tacit concurrence *as* a doctrinal decision, is the Church's decision, and so infallible ; while on the other hand any doctrinal decision which has *not* his express or tacit concurrence—however numerous a body of bishops may have united in promulgating it—is *not* the Church's decision, and is *not* infallible. As to government, a parallel rule holds good : any episcopal ordinance—be the bishops concerned in it more or fewer—is *the Church's* ordinance, where it has his express or tacit sanction ; otherwise not.

From this view it follows, that the Pope is infallible in teaching *ex cathedrâ* ; and also that his authority over the Church is ecclesiastically absolute.\* For if those bishops who act in union with him, be they more or fewer, are privileged to teach the Church infallibly and to govern her supremely,—it is plain

---

\* We use the qualification "ecclesiastically" to avoid possible misconception. Of course, in one sense the Pope's supremacy is not absolute, because it is restrained by God's Law within certain limits ; and (as Ultramontanes consider) it is infallibly restrained by God's Providence from attempting to transgress those limits. But it is "ecclesiastically" absolute ; i. e., subject to no authority on earth.



that such infallibility and such supremacy are ultimately vested, not in them, but in him. It does not however at all follow, that those in every age who have held the premisses, have held explicitly the undeniable conclusion thence deducible. To this we shall return in a later part of our article.

But many a Protestant controversialist ascribes to Ultramontanes a more extreme doctrine than they really hold: he supposes them to consider the Episcopate as the Pope's mere creation and vicegerent; just, e.g., as the Roman Congregations are. But every Catholic would repudiate such a tenet as erroneous, or even heretical. True (according to Ultramontanes) that the Pope assigns to each bishop his diocese, and confers on him jurisdiction; still the difference is vital between a Roman Congregation on the one hand, and bishops on the other. The former were called into existence by the Pope yesterday, and may be abolished by him to-morrow; whereas he has no more power of abolishing the Episcopacy than of abolishing the Papacy itself.\* Moreover every Catholic bishop,—apart altogether from his diocesan duties,—has received from God the commission of co-operating on occasion with his brethren and with the Holy See, whether in preserving purity of faith throughout the orbis terrarum, or in enacting measures of wholesome discipline for the Church Universal.† And for this very reason, the Popes, while calling themselves and called by others “bishops of the Catholic Church,” have

---

\* An eminent theologian, whose authority is peculiarly great on all doctrines concerning *the Church*, has kindly forwarded to us the following expansion of the statement in the text. Christ established, not episcopal *order* merely, but episcopal *jurisdiction*; i. e., He ordained that there should be for ever in the Church, besides the universal pastor, pastors having particular flocks, with power to teach, legislate, inflict censures, &c. &c. The *jus divinum* assigns no limits to this jurisdiction: but it gives the Pope power of assigning limits *ob justam causam*; of which he is supreme judge. Yet the Pope cannot so limit this jurisdiction, as to destroy totally or in substance the idea of episcopal jurisdiction as instituted by Christ; he cannot, e. g., say that in future no bishop shall have any power to make any law for his diocese, inflict any censure, &c. &c. He can do this *ob justam causam* in particular cases, so that the particular bishop loses episcopal jurisdiction; but he cannot do it in so many cases as would constitute the *corpus episcoporum*.

† Dr. Pusey most strangely considers (p. 307) Pope S. Celestine to have contradicted modern Roman Catholic doctrine, when he said “all we [bishops] are engaged in [teaching] by an hereditary right; all we who have come into the Apostles' stead preach the Name of our Lord to all countries in the world. . . . He charged us with it as with a duty devolving in common upon all.” (On Dr. Pusey's most singular mistake, however, in substituting “equally” for “in common,” see our remarks in January, 1866, p. 191.) He considers, too, that S. Gregory contradicted modern Roman Catholic doctrine (p. 309), when he declared, “it is said to the *Universal Church*, ‘whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, &c.’”

uniformly rejected the title of "Universal Bishop." Such a name would imply, that the Pope is the only divinely appointed bishop; and that other bishops are not really successors of the Apostles, but only his mere delegates and representatives.\*

Such, then, are the Ultramontane principles of ecclesiastical unity. And if Dr. Pusey's reasoning against *these* principles is worth absolutely nothing, à fortiori it is worthless, as directed against any less consistent expression of Roman Catholic doctrine. Anglicans in general maintain that our principles are opposed to those of Scripture; and Dr. Pusey in particular argues that they are opposed to those of Antiquity. We will consider therefore in order (1) the sayings of our Blessed Lord recorded in Scripture; (2) the history of Apostolic times, as recorded chiefly in the Acts; and (3) the testimonies of Apostolic Tradition, derivable from the first six centuries. Under each of these heads it will be necessary of course to make a very brief selection, from a very large amount of matter. But on this particular controversy, when once the point at issue has been fairly stated, a very few facts go a very long way indeed; or, rather, it may be said that the ordinary objections will be found crumbling to pieces through their own intrinsic rottenness.

Firstly, then, our Blessed Lord's words are so far from contradicting Ultramontane doctrine, that on the contrary they most strongly and irresistibly confirm it. This is most clearly, laboriously, and powerfully drawn out by Dr. Murray; and we earnestly recommend to our readers the truly interesting and attractive task of studying carefully his most admirable exposition. (See vol. iii. from p. 373 to 421.) We can give but a few hints of the general argument; but those hints will be amply sufficient for our purpose.

When first Simon Barjona was brought into his Saviour's presence, the very first words uttered to him by that Saviour were these: "Thou art Simon son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas" (John i. 42). And this declaration was considered by the Evangelist so important, that even if our Lord uttered other words on that occasion, they have not been reported. The very first thing which happened to this Apostle at the outset of his Christian life, was to be designated as the Church's future Rock. At a later period, in reward for his divinely inspired confession of his Lord's Eternal Sonship, the prediction of change of name was accomplished. Once more Jesus called him by his birth-name; and once more contrasted it with that which he was henceforth to bear (Matt.

---

\* On this name, "Universal Bishop," see Schrader, vol. ii. pp. 89-94.



xvi. 17, 18). Now also for the first time the significance of that name was unfolded. We cannot better exhibit the obvious and unforced sense of our Lord's words, than by quoting Dean Stanley; for perhaps no other living Englishman is more imbued to the very core with detestation of the sacerdotal principle, than is that otherwise most amiable and gentle writer. Where the Dean of Westminster supports Petrine doctrine, we may be very sure that by no possible ingenuity can Scripture be fairly interpreted otherwise. Thus runs his comment on Our Lord's words. In them, he says,—

The Church . . . is represented as a house ; not a temple so much as a beleaguered fortress, according to the figure frequently used by the prophets immediately before the captivity. . . . It is of this fortress . . . that Peter is to be the foundation-rock. *It was no longer to be reared on the literal rock of Zion, but on a living man.* . . . And against this new theocracy . . . as so founded and supported . . . it is declared that the gates of the grave shall not prevail. . . . The promise is clear that, vehement as may be the struggle for its very existence which the . . . Church will have to maintain, yet *such will be the strength of Peter* that, through Christ's blessing, it will survive the shock triumphantly.\*

As to the rest of this most remarkable prophecy, we can but refer to Dr. Murray (pp. 383-396) : we will here only add that it acquires peculiar force from the circumstances under which it was uttered ; from the close connection which it implies between our Lord's own dignity and that of His future vicegerent. This is excellently expressed in the Dean's paraphrase : "Thou hast told Christ what He is, and He tells thee what thou art" (p. 116). It would appear, moreover (p. 118) that this name Cephias or Peter was now borne for the first time. Even Jesus and Mary were already Jewish names ; but Christ invented (so to speak) a new name, in order adequately to honour this great Apostle, and to express with due emphasis his office in the Church. Then consider how completely he became identified with this new name. S. Paul, e.g., never once calls him Simon, but invariably either Cephias or Peter ; so as ever to be reminding those Christians whom he has himself converted, that it is another, and not himself, who is the Church's foundation-Rock.

It is with great reluctance that we pass over the rest of Dr. Murray's irrefragable argument ; and in particular we should have been glad to ponder with due attention that most

---

\* "Essays on the Apostolic Age," pp. 121-3. The Dean preposterously prefaces the substantive "Church" here by the adjective "early," as his only shift to avoid the Roman Catholic conclusion. What syllable is there in our Lord's words on which to found so amazing an interpolation ?

significant passage, Luke xxii. 23-32. We must content ourselves, however, with a passing reference to that illustrious occasion, on which our Lord at once fulfilled His prediction and performed His promise, by conferring on S. Peter his great dignity. In John xxi. 15-17, He expressly distinguishes S. Peter from the other Apostles—again, and for the third time, giving him his full birth-name, Simon Barjona—and endows him with the duty and the prerogative of being shepherd to the whole flock.

Our conclusions far outstrip the necessities of our argument. Our argument, however, may be thus drawn out. We assume throughout, what we established in January, that the Church is essentially one corporate society; and we are inquiring what is her principle or centre of unity. If, as Roman Catholics maintain, S. Peter and his successors constitute that centre, then the utterances of our Blessed Lord are permitted to retain their one obvious and intelligible sense. Peter is that Rock in whose strength the Church will be supported against the attacks of Satan; He is the one supreme shepherd on earth of Christ's lambs and sheep. On the Roman Catholic hypothesis, in proportion as our Lord's sayings are carefully and intently pondered, in that proportion there will be found in them an ever-increasing profoundness, richness, beauty, variousness of signification. But if God had appointed the principle of unity to reside,—not in S. Peter and his successors,—but in a majority of Apostles first and of bishops afterwards, then these sayings would be absolutely unintelligible, or rather plainly false. The Church's Rock would not be one Apostle, but a majority of Apostles; and the same majority would exercise a shepherd's office even over S. Peter himself.

We are next to inquire whether Christ said anything in an opposite direction. No one, we reply, has ever so much as alleged one single text, in which He made the most distant allusion to any principle of unity in the Church other than S. Peter. As regards His various mentions of the Apostolic office,—in the first place no candid person will allege that they are expressed at all so emphatically, so prominently, so pointedly, as His mentions of S. Peter's Primacy. This, however, is quite unimportant to our argument. What concerns us is, that all such pronouncements of our Lord refer without exception to the Apostles' *collective* authority over the Christian flock, and have no bearing whatever on *the internal constitution and mutual relations* of the Apostolic College. In the Apostolic passages He declares, that the Apostles and their successors to the end of time shall teach and govern the Church; and in the Petrine passages He further declares, that S. Peter and *his*

successors are to perform the same office in quite a special sense. There is nothing whatever therefore in the former class, which has the slightest tendency to clash with what is said in the latter.

Our historical refutation of Dr. Pusey would have remained so far complete, had we merely shown that our Lord's various utterances are fully reconcileable with the Roman theory. But we have established much more than this; we have established that they are *not* reconcileable with any other. We have not therefore contented ourselves with answering an objection; but have added a second and important argument for our thesis.

We are next to view the Church of the Apostles in practical action; and for that purpose we open the Acts. It is admitted by Dr. Pusey and by all with whom we are here concerned, that each of the Apostles was individually infallible in *teaching*: we are now inquiring what was their principle of unity wherever they acted corporately in matters of *discipline*. And it follows from what has already been said, that there are three different alternatives which specially demand our consideration. (1) The Apostles may have imaginably received inspiration on matters of discipline, no less than of doctrine; so that harmony was at once secured for their action without argument or deliberation. (2) Their collective decision may have been determined in each case by a *majority* of Apostles. (3) The Roman doctrine may be true: viz., that they acted corporately, precisely so far as they acted in union with S. Peter; and consequently that he possessed over them a real Primacy of authority. Now the second of these alternatives is negatived at once, by the most superficial appeal to facts. If God originally placed the Church under the government of a majority of Apostolic votes, it was implied by that very fact that the Apostles were to remain together throughout their lives; whereas in fact, after a few years of united government, they separated to preach the Gospel in distant lands. By far the most critical and important act of Apostolic discipline was that promulgated at the Council of Jerusalem; and yet at that Council only three of the original Apostles were present. This alternative then must be at once put out of account. It is plain the "*the Apostolic College*" was but a temporary fact, a transient feature, in the Church's early history.

On the other hand there are the strongest indications in the Acts of S. Peter's Primacy.

It was he who arranged the filling up of the Apostolic College through Matthias' election; he fixed the form of election, confining it to those who had been companions of Christ and witnesses of His teaching and acts. He

takes up the word before the people and the Sanhedrim, and works the first miracle for confirming Christ's Resurrection. The punishment of Ananias and Sapphira, the anathema on Simon Magus the first heretic, the first visiting and confirming the Churches suffering under persecution, were all his acts. If he was sent with John by the Apostolic College to the new converts at Samaria, he was himself member and president of that college. So the Jews *sent their high priest Ismael to Nero*, and Ignatius says that the neighbouring Churches in Asia had *sent*, some their *bishops*, some their *priests* and *deacons*.\*

And a still stronger fact was that to which we have already referred; viz. his very name of Peter. While all the other Apostles were called by well-known Jewish names, he was called by one hitherto absolutely unheard of; a name which at once expressed the function, as quite peculiar to its bearer, of standing as the Church's one foundation-Rock.

At the same time, as was to be expected, there was in general such profound and immediate Apostolic agreement as to the measures which the Church's welfare demanded, that the general current of early history is not less consistent with the first, than with the last, of the three alternative theories which we mentioned above. By far the greater portion of the Acts, we say, would fully harmonize with a supposition, that there was no need for mutual conference and deliberation; but that the Holy Ghost on each occasion inspired severally all the Apostles with a clear view of what suited the occasion. There is one most critical period of history however, which places the general principles of the Apostolic government in a far clearer light than any other; and which at once decides the present question. We refer, of course, to the Judaizing controversy; on which we spoke at some length in January from p. 37 to p. 52. We will here refer to those particulars alone, which concern our present subject, and which we did not there expressly consider.

Now, firstly (xv. 36), before the general assembly of Christians came together at Jerusalem, the five Apostles and the local presbyters met separately "to see concerning the matter;"† and the decisions promulgated at the larger meeting were the result of this previous deliberation. On what did such deli-

---

\* Dr. Döllinger on "Christianity and the Church," English translation, vol. i. pp. 101-2. See this brought out at length by Mr. Allies: "S. Peter, his Name and Office," pp. 114-155.

† S. Luke's narrative includes two different meetings. For (1) "*the Apostles and presbyters came together*," and (2) after S. Peter's speech "*the whole multitude was silent*" (v. 12). And the final assent was given (v. 22) "*by the Apostles, and presbyters, and whole Church*."

beration turn? Evidently not on the doctrinal question; for (putting aside all other objections to such a theory) S. Peter (v. 10) at the larger meeting expressed amazement that, after the fact of Cornelius, any doctrinal doubt could remain even among private Christians. This previous deliberation then was on the disciplinary measures needed for the crisis; and the Apostles decided on those, which S. James promulgated at the larger assembly (v. 20).

These commands were at once promulgated, as binding the conscience of every Christian whom they concerned, and as having the Holy Ghost's full authority (vv. 28-9). Here then you have facts which bear most importantly on the present inquiry. The law finally adopted was not miraculously suggested by the Holy Ghost to the mind of each separate Apostle; on the contrary, it resulted from the Apostles' concert and deliberation, not only with each other, but with the Jerusalem presbyters. On the other hand, although only five out of the twelve Apostles concurred therein, it was accepted as obligatory by every one without question. The Apostles then were accounted to act corporately, even though no more were present, or were summoned, than a minority of their number. But what reason can be alleged for this by a controversialist of any school, except only that they were acting in union with S. Peter?

There is no one portion however of Scripture history, from which Protestants have derived so many objections to S. Peter's Primacy, as from the Judaizing controversy. These objections chiefly concern the relations between him and S. Paul; and we devoted an article in January to their detailed refutation. One remains to be considered here; because it is founded on the position, not of S. Paul, but of S. James. We will begin by stating it at the best advantage:—"If S. Peter had possessed a Primacy of authority, it is quite impossible that S. James, not he, should have presided at the Council of Jerusalem, and promulgated the Apostolic decree. But S. James assuredly did occupy this place. It was he who finally summed up the proceedings, and pronounced the 'ego judico' (v. 19) which was carried into effect."

The objection possesses on the surface much plausibility; but it is at once dissipated when you look closely at facts. Its fallacy consists in its ignoring the circumstance, that there were *two* Apostolic pronouncements; viz. (1) the definition of faith, and (2) the disciplinary decree. S. Peter very suitably uttered the former, and S. James very suitably uttered the latter. "Ego judico" undoubtedly means, as the objector alleges, "I judge in my own name and that of my brethren"; "I

pronounce the Apostolic judgment" : but then (as v. 20 demonstratively proves) this judgment was not doctrinal but disciplinary. If one may indulge in conjecture, it would seem far more probable than not that it was S. James who proposed this measure at the preliminary meeting. At all events his position, as specially representing the Jewish element in the Church, made it obviously suitable that *he* should pronounce what had been decreed in *protection* of the Jewish Christians. But if you look carefully at his speech, you will find that, so far from professing to promulgate a definition of faith, on the contrary he expressly refers (v. 14) to S. Peter as having already done so. While on the other hand, so soon as S. Peter had spoken, "*tacuit omnis multitudo*" (v. 12), and the voice of controversy was no longer heard.

We thus then sum up our argument from Apostolic history. If the facts of that history were found fully consistent with the theory of S. Peter's Supremacy, the Anglican objection would be entirely refuted, and our demonstration of that Supremacy would remain untouched. But the case is much stronger. Not only the facts of that history are reconcileable with the Roman theory, but they are *not* reconcileable with any other which has been so much as suggested. Just then as, in considering our Lord's words, we obtained a second independent argument for the Roman conclusion,—so now, in considering Apostolic history, we have a *third* independent argument on the same side.

From Scripture we proceed to Antiquity ; from Apostolic times to post-Apostolic : and it is on these times indeed, and not on Apostolic, that Dr. Pusey lays his principal stress. Before entering however on our direct argument, we will touch briefly a matter, which in itself belongs to our discussion of last January, though it has a close bearing on the present question. Read those most impressive patristic passages on ecclesiastical unity, which Mr. Allies has brought together (pp. 90-115), in the work we name at the head of our article. He begins with S. Clement, who was Pope before S. John's death, and he carries the series down uninterruptedly to the time of S. Augustine. No one doctrine, it is most manifest, more absolutely possessed the mind of the Fathers—not even the doctrine of our Lord's Incarnation and Resurrection—than the doctrine that visible and indefectible unity is an essential attribute of the Church. Students of Church history open Dr. Pusey's pages with a kind of bewilderment ; wondering what solution he can possibly attempt, where facts are so plain and unmistakeable. His principal replies are two : totally



inconsistent indeed with each other; but not the less welcome to a writer, whom his greatest admirers will hardly call logical or clear-headed, and who is in the unfortunate position of having literally not the vestige of a position. Sometimes then Dr. Pusey admits that God placed the Church, as one whole, under the supreme government of the Catholic Episcopate. But, having made this admission, he proceeds to imply that God made no provision whatever for the permanent exercise of this government; and that in fact, during more than one half of the Church's duration, her supreme government has been totally in abeyance. Then on a sudden, as though dimly perceiving the imbecility of such a theory as this, he boldly resorts to the original Tractarian stronghold; \* the (supposed) independent authority given by God to each individual bishop. "Each bishop," he says, wresting S. Cyprian's words to his own anti-Cyprianic purpose, "orders and directs *his own* proceedings; having hereafter to give account of his intentions," not to any superior authority on earth, but only "to the Lord." This latter view, we imagine—as far as so strangely constituted a mind can be considered to hold any view whatever—is the theory to which he himself spontaneously gravitates.

We will here then offer a comment on this latter theory. We say confidently that there is no tenet whatever more absolutely and more obviously disproved than this, by every page of ecclesiastical history from first to last; that it would have been as simply amazing to a Catholic of the second century, as to a [Roman] Catholic of the nineteenth. From the very death of the Apostles, individual bishops were controlled at every turn by Episcopal Synods; as Dr. Pusey himself expressly testifies. Turn to his work called "The Councils of the Church" (Parker, 1857). He tells us (p. 51) that these Synods were held "throughout the second century"; i.e. from the time which immediately succeeded S. John's death. And he had already said (p. 49) that they were "the law of the Church"; and that an emperor's prohibition of them "forced Christians to break *the laws* either of the State or the Church." Every bishop who voted at these Synods—every bishop who considered his conscience bound by their decrees—testified a doctrine directly opposed to Dr. Pusey's; testified the doctrine that individual bishops are *not* invested by God with an authority ecclesiastically supreme.

Now the connection of all this with our present subject is

---

\* See our remarks in January, p. 303.

manifest enough. Whence did these episcopal synods derive *their own* commission? Had God given to *them* an ecclesiastically supreme authority? Dr. Pusey considers that no change took place in this respect down to the age of S. Augustine; and says of *that* period (Eirenicon, p. 67) that “the African canons stood on *their own* authority, as did those of *all other Churches*; the Greek, the Spanish, the Gallican, and the British.” Does he hold then, that God gave to each national synod supreme authority over all the Christians of that nation? that by God’s original appointment the African Church was one corporate society, the Greek a second, the Spanish a third, the Gallican a fourth, and the British a fifth? If he do *not* mean this, his words are unintelligible; if he *do* mean it, he has here broached a third theory wilder than even his other two. One understands the *Tractarian* statement—amazing though it be—that S. Peter’s full power has been transmitted to every individual bishop: but who in the world ever dreamed that it was transmitted, not indeed to every individual bishop, but to every national primate? The Episcopate is at least of Divine institution; but Dr. Pusey will not himself maintain that the office of national primate is immediately appointed by God.

At all events, every one with whom we are now in controversy—every one who admits indeed the Church’s indefectible corporate unity, but denies that Rome is the principle of that unity,—must entirely agree with us as to these Episcopal Synods; he must say, just as we do, that they derived their commission from *the tacit assent of the Church’s supreme authority*. If God had vested this authority in the majority of bishops, it is plain that their votes could not be taken on each occasion, while persecutions distracted and convulsed the Church. If on the contrary (as Roman Catholics hold) the Supreme Pontiff possessed this authority, it is equally plain that he could not duly and fully exercise it, at a time when he was himself the most prominent object of those persecutions; \* and again, when communication was always difficult and often impossible, between him and distant portions of the Church. The Popes acted, precisely as it was their *duty* to act on the supposition of their possessing a Divinely-given supremacy. They well knew that the Catholic Episcopate had received from Apostolic times the very same body of doctrine, the very same principles and rules of discipline, which they had themselves inherited. So long, therefore, as no intolerable evil resulted

---

\* See some admirable remarks of Dr. Murray, vol. iii. pp. 615-618.



to the Church from their forbearance, they gladly saw God's work done for them by local authorities, whether diocesan, provincial, or national. But when any serious emergency arose—especially when doctrinal purity was exposed to any peril—they at once peremptorily interfered. We need no other testimony for this fact, than that of the Protestant world itself; whose stock charge against the ante-Nicene Popes is their uniform exhibition of “an aggressive, usurping, domineering spirit.” No candid reader of history can possibly doubt that the Popes *did* exhibit an aggressive, usurping, domineering spirit, *unless* it be true that Christ had given them authority over His whole flock.

For various reasons, which we have not space here to recount, this comparative rarity of intervention, on the part of the Church's supreme authority, was by no means so calamitous in those early centuries as it would have been at a later period. Still it was necessarily a serious evil; and our present opponents (whoever they are) must hold as strongly as we do, that as soon as peace was restored to the Church, a certain change of discipline became of great importance. All who hold that the whole Church is placed under any one supreme authority, must admit that the ante-Nicene method of government, though required by the time, was abnormal and irregular. Dr. Pusey says most truly (p. 73) that “*what was not of divine right cannot become so;*” but he has failed to perceive that a power may have been most truly *given* by God, which nevertheless cannot be wisely *exercised* until the favourable moment shall arise.

This preliminary difficulty then being easily solved, we are brought to the point really at issue. Dr. Pusey considers those centuries which elapsed before the Photian schism as a kind of golden age; and he fully admits that during those centuries the Church's corporate unity was inviolate. We argued last January—we venture to think most conclusively—that this unity is not the Church's “happiest condition,” but her essential and unalterable constitution. We are now occupied in inquiring what is the centre and principle of this unity. We began our article by giving irrefragable proof, that *the Holy See* is this divinely-established centre of unity; but Dr. Pusey alleges that the facts of his golden age are irreconcilable with such a supposition. This objection therefore we now proceed to consider. We will treat separately (1) the ante-Nicene and (2) the subsequent centuries; because of the signal difference between the circumstances of those two periods.

But firstly, considerable light is thrown on our subject by

the Apostolic history itself. If God originally entrusted the Church's government to a majority of voting Apostles, a strong presumption would arise that He entrusted it after their death to a majority of voting bishops. On the contrary, if the Apostles were commissioned to exercise that government, not as represented by a majority, but as acting in union with S. Peter,—then there is every reason to expect that post-Apostolic bishops are corporately united on a similar principle. And there is, moreover, one very remarkable fact, conspicuous on the surface of Church history from the very first, which strikingly confirms this antecedent presumption; and to which (very characteristically) our prejudiced opponent nowhere makes the slightest reference. The later bishops *in general* were regarded as successors of the Apostles in general; but hardly ever was an *individual bishop* spoken of as successor of an individual Apostle, excepting only to S. Peter. The instances e. g. are most rare of the Bishop of Jerusalem being called successor to S. James; whereas the whole Catholic world concurred from the very first in regarding the Bishop of Rome as successor to S. Peter. This fact alone suffices to establish, that his office is, in one respect or other, different *in kind* from that of any other bishop.

Now as to ante-Nicene times in particular. We assume from our January article that in these times the Catholic Episcopate, acting corporately, had supreme power over the Church. But (as we have so often said) this proposition is simply unmeaning, until you have explained *how* it acted corporately; what was its principle of unity. Roman Catholics maintain that the Holy See was this principle of unity; and they point to various facts, which imply the existence of such a tradition in the earliest post-Apostolic times. There are very many facts, we say, which undeniably indicate the Roman doctrine, and not a few testimonies which distinctly affirm it. We shall not be expected to draw these out in detail: on this head we must refer to Catholic controversial works; but in truth, as will soon be seen, the scope of our argument in no way requires such detail. We will only mention that, as Mr. Sconce\* points out, every single Father (unless S. Ignatius be to some extent an exception†) who speaks of bishops at all,

---

\* We think most highly of that work of Mr. Sconce to which we refer, "The Testimony of Antiquity to the Supremacy of the Holy See" (Burns and Oates). It is very far less known than it deserves to be; and, indeed, we hardly know any treatise which we should so strongly recommend on this particular subject to a candid Anglican inquirer.

† But not really an exception; for the phrase, "*ecclesia quæ præsidet in loco Romanæ regionis*," is very significant. See Dr. Murray, vol. iii. p. 557.

speaks also of the Roman Primacy; and we will cite the well-known passages of SS. Irenæus and Cyprian. S. Irenæus, as F. Schrader excellently draws out (vol. i. p. 81), expresses these four propositions: (1) the *fact* of the universal communion [in faith] of all Catholics with the Roman Church: (2) the *necessity* of this communion: (3) the *cause* both of the fact and of the obligation, derived from this circumstance; viz., that the Roman Church is at once a centre round which the faithful coalesce, and also a model in doctrine to all other Churches: (4) the *reason* of these various prerogatives; consisting in the peculiar "principalitas" which she possesses. (See also Dr. Murray's admirable exposition of the passage from p. 558 to p. 563, vol. iii.) So much on S. Irenæus. S. Cyprian, who (as we said in January, pp. 113-115) is so voluminous and energetic in behalf of the Church's indivisible unity, expresses very distinctly the divinely-given *principle* of unity. "It is from the chair of Peter," he says, from that "*principal Church*" that "*hath issued the unity of the priesthood.*" "*Thy communion,*" oh Cornelius of Rome, "*is the unity and the charity of the Catholic Church.*" (Sconce, p. 16.)

But it is really wasting time and space to pursue such testimonies; for our argument only requires us to express the safest of all imaginable propositions. Certain Christians, we say, in the three first centuries regarded the Roman Bishop as having quite a different position from other bishops in keeping together that corporate society called the Church. Whereas the Church is one edifice built up by God, certain Christians considered S. Peter (in himself and in his successors) to be the Rock on which that one edifice was founded; whereas the Church is by divine ordinance indefectibly and corporately one, certain Christians considered communion with the Holy See to be the appointed principle of unity.

On the other hand (as we have so often observed) if the divinely appointed principle of unity be *not* the Papacy, it must be some other which admits of being named. God, e. g., may have ordained that *the majority of bishops* is infallible in teaching and supreme in governing. We are next therefore to inquire, what ante-Nicene testimonies or indications can be adduced, for some other principle of unity *distinct* from the Papal. And to this inquiry the answer is most simple. Not one controversialist, however learned, has so much as suggested *one* such testimony or indication. Our argument, therefore, is most direct. That the ante-Nicene Fathers ascribed to the Church corporate unity as an essential attribute, is not less certain on the very surface of history, than that modern Roman Catholics ascribe to her that attribute. But if God

endowed the Church with indefectible corporate unity, it follows by absolute necessity that He endowed her with some *principle* of unity; and if the Apostles taught the former, they taught also the latter. You approach the ante-Nicene writers, who lived nearest to the Apostles, that you may learn from them what *was* the Apostolic doctrine on the principle of unity. You find in these writers various concurrent testimonies, and a large number of concurrent facts, stating or implying the *Roman* principle of unity; while as to any other, different from this, there is nowhere so much as the slightest hint of such an one having ever been heard of. The Roman therefore, and no other, must have been the doctrine taught by the Apostles. Here also we must repeat what has been said on two earlier occasions in this article. If we merely showed that ante-Nicene facts are *reconcilable* with the Roman theory, we should have done absolutely all which our argument requires; for our direct proof of that theory rests (as has been seen) on grounds altogether different. But we have done a great deal more than was necessary for our argument. We have shown, not merely that ante-Nicene facts are *reconcilable* with the Roman theory, but also that (even considered exclusively in their own mutual light) they suffice to establish it. They thus furnish a fourth independent argument for our conclusion.

We are next to investigate a period, which may be expected to determine most unmistakeably the point at issue: that of the early Ecumenical Councils. When Catholic bishops assemble from every part of Christendom, to exercise in common their divinely given office of teaching and governing the Church, one may expect confidently to find some clear exhibition of the corporate principle which unites them into one body. We will take the four first Councils as representing the rest; and they are indeed those on which Dr. Pusey and all Anglicans lay their greatest stress.

For reasons which will presently appear, we begin with the Council of Ephesus. We would earnestly draw Dr. Pusey's attention to the facts of this Council, as brought out by Dr. Murray (vol. iii. pp. 577-586).\* We will here most briefly insert a few relevant particulars. Pope S. Celestine thus charged his legates, on their departure for Ephesus:—"If a discussion should arise, *you are to declare judgment on the sentiments of the bishops*; not yourselves to undergo a trial." S. Cyril presided over the Council, avowedly as S. Celestine's

---

\* F. Harper also treated this Council most powerfully, in a sermon which our readers will find noticed in our number for July, 1865, p. 264.

vicegerent. The Ephesine Fathers pronounced Nestorius's condemnation, "*being compelled thereto through the sacred canons and the letter of our most holy father and fellow minister (συλλειτουργου) Celestine*" (p. 580). The Roman legates, who accidentally did not arrive till after this condemnation had been pronounced, produced a letter from S. Celestine, stating that he sent them for the purpose of *carrying into effect what he had already determined*: nor did any one present dream of taking exception to this letter (p. 581). Lastly Philip, one of them, declared—and all the assembled bishops gave tacit assent to the declaration—that "S. Peter was chief or head of the Apostles, and *the foundation of the Catholic Church*; and that *to this time and always he lives and exercises judgment in the person of his successors*" (p. 583). No man in his senses then can doubt that the Ephesine Fathers considered the principle of their corporate action to be their union with S. Peter's successor.

As to the Council of Chalcedon, there can be no need for more than extracting a few well-known passages, from the letter addressed to Pope S. Leo by the bishops there assembled. "Thou didst preside over us," they say, "*as head over the members.*" It is "thy Apostolic sanctity" to whom "*the custody of the vineyard was entrusted by the Saviour*" (p. 593).<sup>\*</sup> Certainly the very last thing these bishops could have imagined would be that the Pope was subject to an episcopal majority; or, indeed, to any other ecclesiastical authority whatever.

We now go back to the second Ecumenical Council,—that of Constantinople. Now this was not intrinsically an Ecumenical Council at all:† as Dr. Pusey points out (p. 90), it was in itself only an Eastern Council; and its commission therefore was derived (as Dr. Pusey will himself admit) from the express or tacit approval of the Church's supreme authority. Moreover, as Dr. Murray mentions (vol. ii. p. 505), no acts whatever are extant of its history: and indeed very few remains of any kind; viz., a letter to the Emperor, seven canons, its well-known Profession of Faith, and a synodical letter. Even had it left behind a far more copious record, since it did not profess to be a general gathering of Catholic bishops, there was no reason to expect from it any distinct testimony on the question before us. It has nothing to say either for or against the Roman principle of unity.

---

<sup>\*</sup> A most graphic picture of this Council is given, and its Papal spirit most clearly pointed out, by F. Newman in his *Essay on Development*, pp. 293–307.

† To use Dr. Murray's expression, it was Ecumenical "in exitu" but not "in convocatione" or "in celebratione" (vol. iii. pp. 173–177).

As to the Nicene Council, there is a similar scarcity of authentic information; though not quite to the same extent. Dr. Murray (vol. iii. pp. 675-679) has given, we think, a moral demonstration of the fact, that Hosius presided as Pope S. Silvester's vicegerent. But there is no reason at all for insisting on this. It is absolutely certain from documentary evidence, that Hosius signed first in order; then two Roman presbyters as representing the Pope; and then (*after* these three) the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. It is also documentarily certain, that no other bishop *except* the Roman signed by representatives at all. To take all this then on the lowest ground, it points in some degree to a conclusion, that the Nicene bishops regarded Papal co-operation as their principle of united action; while as to any *other* principle of unity, distinct from this, no such theory has ever been so much as ascribed to them.

And the same may be said of all this period, just as of all the preceding. Its writers speak indeed far more frequently and more emphatically on the Primacy than did their predecessors, as having come more clearly to see its vital importance; while, on the other hand, no controversialists have adduced from that period one single Father, whom they even allege as holding any principle of unity *distinct* from the Papal. Nay, we may add that no anti-Roman controversialists have themselves so much as suggested or put into words any such imaginable theory. The conclusion then which follows, as to the *later* portion of Dr. Pusey's golden age, is precisely the same with that which followed as to the *earlier*.

We are next to consider broadly and generally the various historical objections to Papal doctrine, which may be found scattered confusedly and unmethodically up and down Dr. Pusey's book. And first of all we must protest emphatically against his constant implication, that if he adduces one single fact of the past which Roman Catholics are unable completely to elucidate, he has a right to intone the chant of victory. In one sense indeed our protest is superfluous; for certainly he has not adduced any fact, which is not capable of ready and complete explanation. But F. Harper showed, in his Essay on the Immaculate Conception, how far stronger are the apparent historical objections to that doctrine, than any which had occurred to Dr. Pusey's mind; and we cannot, therefore, feel any confidence, that far stronger apparent objections are not adducible against Papal prerogatives, than any to be found in the Eirenicon. We protest therefore vehemently, at starting, against the above-mentioned implication. On what imagin-



able ground has Dr. Pusey a right to expect, that every fact of ecclesiastical history, which has come down to us at all, shall have come down to us in so accurate and complete a shape, as to be capable of full explanation? Is this the case then with secular history? Will Dr. Pusey tell his readers who wrote the letters of Junius? or who was the man in the iron mask? or who built the round towers of Ireland? Are there not absolutely unanswerable objections to every theory on these subjects which has yet been adduced? Yet Dr. Pusey will admit, we suppose, that there is some real solution of the difficulty, though he may not happen to know it. Considering indeed the vast extent of ecclesiastical history and the singular definiteness of Roman doctrine, it is a matter for real amazement that there are so few facts of the past which give difficulty to Roman Catholics.

Dr. Pusey, of all men, should shrink from so reckless a mode of reasoning. How admirable is his zeal for the doctrine of Scriptural inspiration! Yet suppose he were treated by a rationalist as he treats the Roman Catholic Church. "Explain to me "at once," such is his opponent's peremptory summons, "how "this text is consistent with that, or with the facts of history; "harmonize the Evangelists as to the day on which our Lord "celebrated the paschal feast; as to the exact hour at which "He died on the Cross; as to the exact order of His subsequent "appearances; or else confess that your cherished doctrine is "an empty pretension, excogitated by priestly tyrants for the "purpose of reducing men into intellectual slavery." Yet such is Dr. Pusey's tone in dealing with Catholics. "Explain "this very moment," he says peremptorily, "the case of "Liberius; of Apiarius; of Honorius; or else confess that "the whole series of Popes pursued an unholy project of en- "croachment and usurpation, with a view to their own "aggrandisement."

The second particular which we criticise, is his strange assumption, that everything ever said by any single Father proceeds necessarily from Apostolic Tradition. We will illustrate this habit of thought from the case on which he lays more stress perhaps than on any other; and which we shall consider, therefore, explicitly in our next number: we mean the contest between SS. Stephen and Cyprian. We will here take for granted that the writings are genuine which record this contest; though on that matter we shall have something to say in October. Well: S. Stephen claimed, it appears, a certain authority, on the question of the Baptism conferred by heretics; and S. Cyprian repudiated that authority. "Behold," exclaims Dr. Pusey, "here is the Pope claiming

“ an authority unknown to Tradition ; as is evident from “ S. Cyprian’s testimony.” Why, by the same way of reasoning you could prove the exact contradictory. S. Stephen, we suppose, was not the less a Father because he was also a Pope. On Dr. Pusey’s principles then we might at once argue, from the very fact of S. Stephen *claiming* this authority, that Tradition sanctioned that claim. And indeed, even on the surface, there would be far stronger ground for this argument than for Dr. Pusey’s ; because Dr. Pusey himself holds that S. Cyprian was completely wrong on the Baptismal question. On one most important matter of doctrine, Dr. Pusey considers that S. Stephen interpreted Tradition rightly and S. Cyprian wrongly : surely, then, this is some warrant for assuming, that on *other* matters also S. Stephen’s acquaintance with Tradition was greater than S. Cyprian’s.

Dr. Pusey will naturally ask us to suggest some method, for discriminating Apostolic Tradition from the private opinion of an individual Father. This is far too large a matter to be treated episodically ; but we will venture to lay down one simple rule, which will serve for every single difficulty adduced in the Eirenicon. We would thus therefore address Dr. Pusey : If you think that S. Cyprian testified to some Apostolic tradition which S. Stephen opposed, we have a right before all things to hear from you *what* that tradition *was*. You are confident, it seems, (1) that S. Cyprian’s view of the Church’s constitution differed essentially from S. Stephen’s ; and (2) that his, and not the other, is that which the Apostles taught. Please then to explain—surely it must be very easy for you to do so—what *was* S. Cyprian’s view, thus received traditionally from the Apostles. Did he consider, as in many parts of your book you seem to think he did, that every bishop is ecclesiastically supreme over his own diocese ? On the contrary, no one took a more prominent part than he in those Episcopal Synods, which were constantly controlling individual bishops. Moreover, at one period of his life, when he was contemplating (not the question of Baptism, but) this very question of the Church’s constitution, he distinctly laid down that all bishops were placed by God under one supreme ecclesiastical government.\* You will reply at once that he considered *the Catholic Episcopate* as the supreme government ; and so *we* say also. But we proceed to ask you, what he held to be the *principle of unity* in that Episcopate. Did he think, e. g., that a *majority* of voting bishops governed the Church ? that the Bishop of Rome was subject to that majority ?

---

\* See our number of last January, pp. 113, 114.



Or did S. Cyprian think that a majority of patriarchs, or of primates, or of metropolitans, was endowed by God with supreme authority? Not one syllable can you quote from him, which would lead any one to dream that any such thought ever once entered his mind. Most certainly therefore the principles, on which he acted in resisting S. Stephen, did not rest on any Apostolic tradition concerning the Church's constitution. Why is this so certain? For this simple reason: you cannot so much as *name* any doctrine whatever on the Church's constitution,—of which you will even *allege* that it is Apostolic, and of which you will at the same time allege that it was held by S. Cyprian. You are driven yourself to explain that Saint's actions, not by ascribing to him any definite and traditional anti-Roman doctrine, but by some different method altogether. What the true explanation is, we will consider expressly in our next number.

It is impossible of course in a review to consider one by one Dr. Pusey's patristic citations; if we attempted it, our controversy with him must extend over some ten or twelve years. We have the less reluctance, however, in giving up any such endeavour, because we have every reason to hope that F. Harper will devote a second volume of "Peace through the Truth" to this very controversy. Our readers, who have so keenly relished his hand-to-hand conflict with Dr. Pusey on Transubstantiation and on the Immaculate Conception, will well know how rich a treat they may expect on this new field of argument and erudition. For ourselves, we can but give certain general comments on the patristic objections alleged by our opponent. These are divisible into two main classes. Firstly, he adduces various instances in which this or that Father seems (as Dr. Pusey thinks) by no means to have held the full Roman Catholic doctrine on Papal prerogatives; and, secondly, he adduces various instances, in which Roman Catholics themselves (he considers) must admit, that Popes have in fact exhibited themselves as fallible. These two classes of objections differ from each other essentially, as to the kind of answer that can be given them. On the first class it is very easy to lay down certain general principles, which apply in common to all, and which may readily be adapted to each individual case. But to the other class of objections—as is evident from its very nature—no other reply is abstractedly possible, except a consideration of them one by one. Our plan of action, then, will be as follows:—In our next number we will consider those *individual instances* alleged by Dr. Pusey, which we are able to consider at all. But before concluding our present article we will express most briefly

those *general principles*, which will be found applicable in every case to the whole *first class* of objections. To this we at once proceed.

We maintain then that, during the whole of Dr. Pusey's golden age, all those writers whom he would himself account Catholic held explicitly and most undoubtingly the doctrines which follow. They held (1) that the Church's corporate and hierarchical unity is essential and indefectible: (2) that the centre and principle of this unity is S. Peter or his successor: (3) that the Catholic Episcopate, acting in union with the Holy See, has been invested by God with the supreme power of governing the Church: (4) that the same Episcopate, acting in the same union, has been endowed by God with the duty and with the privilege of infallibly preserving, in integrity and unsullied purity, a great body of dogma handed down by the Apostles: (5) that this privilege, however, does not extend to coining what is new; to receiving and authenticating fresh revelations: but exclusively to enunciating and defending, whether against direct or indirect attack, that one Faith given once for all. There is no one passage, cited by Dr. Pusey from any one Father, which has so much as the superficial appearance of denying any one among these five propositions: unless, indeed, you except one single expression of S. Cyprian's, which Dr. Pusey so curiously wrests into a support of that most anti-Cyprianic tenet, the independence of individual bishops.

Now Dr. Pusey will not himself deny, that these five propositions lead by necessary consequence to the full Roman Catholic doctrine. At the same time we on our side admit most readily, that not unfrequently, in the heat and hurry of action and as some particular case arose, this or that Father did not rightly *apply* those principles which he most firmly held. In particular, when Popes, as in duty bound, laboured (as Mr. Allies expresses it p. 77) to "unify" the Church more and more closely; when with that view they put forth from time to time a greater power, not than they had hitherto *possessed*, but than they had hitherto *exercised*; now and then the bishops, whose liberty of action was thus diminished, not unnaturally appealed to their former comparative independence, as though it had been sanctioned by Apostolic Tradition. Lastly, at any given period the Pope of the day—as was to be expected from one whom God had made "guardian of the vineyard"—saw far more clearly than others the true extent and legitimate application of his own prerogative. We are perfectly confident, that there is no one objection of Dr. Pusey's former class, for which these considerations will not most amply account. Mr. Allies applies them with singular power and suc-

cess to the whole case of S. Augustine and Apiarius (pp. 69-80).

In our next number we hope at length to close our controversy with Dr. Pusey. Firstly, we will apply the principles just laid down to those two events, which all admit to be more perplexing for a Catholic than any other, and on which Dr. Pusey lays his principal stress; viz. the resistance of SS. Cyprian and Augustine to the Popes of their day. We shall next proceed to say what is necessary on Dr. Pusey's alleged instances of Papal fallibility. Most of these, indeed, are mere reproductions of what has been again and again both urged and refuted in controversy; and on none of these shall we speak, beyond a brief treatment of those chief representative instances, S. Liberius and Honorius. But there is a certain number of objections (pp. 288-316) which Dr. Pusey has specially addressed to ourselves. We had pointed out, and Dr. Pusey admits, that Pius IX. (like preceding Popes) claims infallibility for very many decisions *ex cathedrâ*, which are not definitions of faith: and in our view, as a matter of course, whatever power a Pope *claims* he certainly *possesses*. It is against this particular class of decisions, that Dr. Pusey brings together that assemblage of objections to which we are here referring; and we will not fail in our next number carefully to consider this question. We were quite amazed indeed, when first we read the facts alleged against us by Dr. Pusey, at their singular weakness and irrelevance. We will then conclude by adding a few final remarks, on what we must plainly call the narrow and unworthy controversial spirit, which animates and pervades the whole of Dr. Pusey's volume.

---

## ART. II.—JOHN TETZEL.

*Tetzel und Luther, oder Lebensgeschichte und Rechtfertigung des Ablasspredigers und Inquisitors, Dr. Johann Tetzel, aus dem Predigerorden.* Von VALENTIN GRÖNE, Doctor der Theologie. Soest und Olpe. Verlag der Nasse'schen Buchhandlung. 1853 (pp. 237).

OF all Luther's contemporary opponents none experienced so much of his foul-mouthed vituperation as the Dominican preacher of indulgences, John Tetzel—a vituperation which Protestant writers, down to the present day, have not ceased, with unmitigated virulence, to heap upon his memory.

Nor have Catholic writers done much to defend Tetzel's calumniated reputation. On the contrary, they have in general allowed themselves to be deluded by Protestant prejudice, and so to have abstained from referring, in his behalf, to original sources of information. This unworthy course they have pursued as though they viewed Tetzel in the light of a personage not worth quarrelling about, whom, without detriment to the Church, they might safely abandon to the enemy, nay, whom it might perhaps be as well thus to abandon. They were fully aware that it was not for preaching Pope Leo's Indulgence that Luther really attacked Tetzel. The Indulgence was but the pretext seized by Luther for openly broaching the heretical opinions which, ever since the year 1515, he had secretly formed. Neither did Luther owe his success to the alleged abuses of the Papal Indulgence. He owed his success to the wide spread moral corruption of his times. Had Leo X. proclaimed no Indulgence at all, Luther's calamitous Reformation could hardly have been prevented.

Three Protestant biographies of John Tetzel have been written in Germany. The earliest, written by Godfried Hecht in Latin, appeared in 1707. About the same time a Life of Tetzel in German was published by Jacob Vogel. The third, a compilation of both, is by Friedrich Hoffmann, and appeared at Leipsic in 1844. They are all three, more or less, just such *ex parte* productions as might be expected, full of obloquy founded on garbled quotations and falsified facts. The most virulent is Hoffmann's book, the least so Hecht's. In copiousness of original research Vogel far surpasses Hecht and Hoffmann. As a counterpoise to these biographies the Catholic party produced nothing till the year 1817. An anonymous work then appeared at Frankfort on the Main, entitled: *Ver-*

*traute Briefe zweier Katholiken über den Ablass-Streit Dr. Martin Luthers wider Dr. Johann Tetzel.* This work is supposed to have been written by a Jesuit, and, although it contains many strong points in vindication of Tetzel's injured character, it would not seem to have had this object so much in view as the defence of the doctrine of Indulgences against the attacks made on it by reason of the year 1817 being the tercentenary year of the Reformation, and celebrated as such throughout Protestant Germany. What Audin in his *Life of Luther* says in favour of Tetzel proceeds more from feeling than historical research, and is consequently of inferior importance. Under these circumstances it is gratifying to meet with such a book in defence of Tetzel as Dr. Valentine Gröne has produced, in which, while he exhibits the vilified Dominican as an able, pious, and devoted champion of the Holy See, in a manner that establishes his title in future to that character on a solid basis, he also contributes to the history of Luther and the Reformation a most interesting fund of knowledge and reflection.

The true date of Tetzel's birth appears to be unknown. It is conjectured to have fallen a little later than the middle of the fifteenth century. He was a native of Leipsic, where his father was a citizen and goldsmith. Dr. Gröne has much to say about the etymology of his family name. But this we may pass over as superfluous. Of Tetzel's boyhood and youth nothing is recorded until the year 1482. It was the year of his matriculation as a student of the Leipsic University. He is now said to have shown superior abilities and great application. For the art of rhetoric he soon evinced a strong predilection. Not content with attending the lectures of Conrad Kimpina on the theory of declamation, he sought to gain a practical knowledge of it by assiduously frequenting the sermons of the Dominicans. This led to his forming an attachment to the order of which, in 1490, he became a member. Two years before he had received his Bachelor's degree, being the sixth on a list of fifty candidates.

In the seclusion of the Dominican convent of St. Paul's at Leipsic, Tetzel renounced the study of humanities in order to devote himself all the more zealously to the writings of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church.

This course he adopted as the surest means of qualifying himself to become a preaching friar in the true spirit of St. Dominic. "The goldsmith's son," says Jacob Vogel, "possessed every requisite to form a public speaker, a clear understanding, a good memory, an eloquent tongue, an animated delivery, a manly and sonorous voice, the charm of which was enhanced by a tall and slender figure."

His first essays as a preacher were confined to the Church of his convent. Their effect was such that his prior, Martin Adam, soon gave him permission to preach beyond the convent walls, at the different places belonging to its jurisdiction. In Tetzel's day it was still customary not to confer Holy Orders until, according to ancient canonical rule, the candidate had reached the age of thirty years. This age Tetzel attained before the close of the century. He was then ordained priest by Philo von Trotha, Bishop of Merseburg. About the same time Pope Alexander VI. proclaimed the Great Jubilee. It was the eighth proclamation since the first by Boniface VIII. Tetzel received from his superiors the appointment to preach the Jubilee Indulgence. He preached it at Leipsic, Zwickau, Nürnberg, Magdeburg, Görlitz, Halle, and other towns. So well did he perform his duty, that he established his fame as one of the most powerful popular preachers that had ever appeared in Germany. "By reason of his extraordinary eloquence," says Godfried Hecht, "he acquired great authority over the people, and rose higher and higher in renown." Dr. Gröne adverts to various contemporary attestations of Tetzel's surprising success with the masses. It was ascribed to his resounding voice, his richly metaphorical language, and logical clearness.

In 1504 Pope Julius II. proclaimed an Indulgence in favour of the Teutonic Knights in Prussia, whom the Russians and Tartars had reduced to great straits. On this occasion Tetzel was again chosen to preach, along with Christian Baumhauer of Nuremberg. He preached the Indulgence in Prussia, Brandenburg, and Silesia. At the same time the Dominican Priory of Glogau becoming vacant, was offered to him. He was little more than thirty years old. "What stronger proof," says Dr. Gröne, "could be given him of the high veneration in which he was held by his Order?" But he did not accept the dignity. In the early part of 1507 he returned to Leipsic. On his way he preached for the Teutonic Knights at Dresden. So great was the desire to hear him that the largest church in the city was found too small for the congregation. Duke George of Saxony caused him, in consequence, to preach from a window of his palace. The same zealous Duke, on Tetzel's arrival at Leipsic, received him outside the gates at the head of the clergy, the civic authorities, and dignitaries of the University, and conducted him in solemn procession to S. Paul's Convent. Here Tetzel again retired, a simple friar, to the seclusion of his cell. In 1510 he was employed to preach an Indulgence of a peculiar sort, granted in aid of building a bridge, with a chapel on it, over the Elbe at Torgau. The Saxon princes,



being themselves short of funds, and finding the people unwilling to contribute the money for nothing, had obtained in 1491 from Innocent VIII. the Indulgence in question, by which all the faithful in Saxony who should give the twentieth part of a gold florin towards the bridge and chapel at Torgau were permitted to eat butter and drink milk in Lent, on the Rogation Days, and the vigils of feasts, for a term of twenty years. In 1510 Pope Julius II. renewed this Indulgence for another twenty years. Such Indulgences were not unfrequent in the Middle Ages. In 1310 Pope John XXII., as Dr. Gröne tells us, granted an Indulgence of forty days towards the erection of the bridge at Dresden. When Julius II. died in 1513, the great aspiration of his successor, Leo X., was to complete the magnificent temple of Christendom, S. Peter's Basilica, begun by Julius in 1506. But Leo found that the wars waged by his high-minded predecessor in defence of S. Peter's patrimony, and the independence of Italy, had exhausted the Papal treasury. Julius having raised the funds for laying the foundations of S. Peter's by means of an Indulgence, Leo resolved to do the like towards the expenses of finishing the work. The Bull which he accordingly issued, granting a Plenary Indulgence to all Christendom, reached Germany in 1515. The commission to preach it was given to the Franciscans. For Saxony and the north of Germany this commission was divided between the Guardian of the Franciscans of Mentz and Albert of Brandenburg, the newly-installed Archbishop of the city. But the Guardian of the Franciscans declining to act, the entire commission passed into the hands of the Archbishop. It was merely as a special favour that he had been included in the commission at all. His Grace, in fact, had been obliged to contract a heavy debt with the Fuggers of Augsburg, the Rothschilds of the day, in order to pay the fees on his pallium, which, for an Archbishop of Mentz, amounted to no less a sum than thirty thousand gold florins. As it was not customary for the Archbishops to pay this sum out of their privy purse, it had to be levied on the faithful of the diocese. But this had been done twice within the last ten years for the immediate predecessors of Albert of Brandenburg, viz., Archbishops Berthold and James Uriel. To raise the sum a third time under such circumstances seemed impossible without assistance. Wherefore, in order to afford relief to his flock, Archbishop Albert had obtained leave from Rome to appropriate a portion of the proceeds of the Papal Indulgence in his province towards the payment of his debt. This fact suffices, in Dr. Gröne's opinion, to clear the Archbishop from the reproach of avarice cast at him by Protestant writers, who have also not

failed to impute all sorts of unworthy motives to him for making choice of the Dominican, John Tetzel, as his chief sub-commissioner, or quæstor, in preaching the Indulgence. But, says Dr. Gröne, is not the Archbishop's choice of Tetzel tantamount to a refutation of the calumnies heaped upon him as one of the vilest, not only of friars, but of men? Archbishop Albert proceeded with the greatest caution, and issued very clear and exact instructions, both on the nature of the Indulgence, and the manner in which it should be preached. Had Tetzel really been the notoriously bad monk Protestant writers say he was, how could the Archbishop, with the knowledge of such a fact, have ventured to choose him at all? How could Tetzel be expected to preach with any effect, if, as is asserted, he was a disgrace to his order, a man who did not scruple openly to perpetrate the worst excesses? But Archbishop Albert of Mentz had, as we have seen, very particular reasons of his own for promoting, as much as possible, the success of Pope Leo's Indulgence, and, accordingly, he made choice of Tetzel as his chief quæstor, not because he thought a coarse sordid monk of infamous reputation the likeliest person he knew of to stir up the religious fervour of the people, but because he judged this might best be done by one who, while eminent alike for piety and for zeal in the cause of the Church and the Holy See, enjoyed the renown of being one of the most eloquent preachers then living in Germany. What motive could be more natural, more just, more obvious than this?

Tetzel entered on his duties as preacher of the papal Indulgence for the Archbishop of Mentz with his accustomed zeal and ability. What he had to announce in virtue of the "*Instructio Summaria*" of the Archbishop was substantially this: That all persons who repented of, and confessed, fasting, their sins, who received Holy Communion, said certain prayers in seven different Churches, or before as many altars, and contributed according to their means a donation towards S. Peter's Basilica, should obtain full remission of the temporal punishment due to their sins, once for their lives, and then as often as they should be in danger of death; that this Indulgence might be applied by way of intercession to the souls in Purgatory, while bedridden people were to be able to obtain it by devoutly confessing and communicating in their chambers before a sacred image or picture.

In the entire document, says Dr. Gröne, there does not occur a thought which the Church at the present day would hesitate to subscribe. The "*Instructio Summaria*" further declares, that those who cannot afford a pecuniary donation



are not therefore to be denied the grace of the Indulgence, which seeks not less the salvation of the faithful than the advantage of the Basilica. "Let such as have no money," it says, "replace their donations by prayer and fasting, for the Kingdom of Heaven must not stand more open to the rich than the poor." What a refutation have we here of the slanderous clamour against Pope Leo's Indulgence as an alleged traffic in sin! With respect to the conduct of Tetzel himself and his subordinates, they are admonished to lead an exemplary life, to avoid taverns, and to abstain from unnecessary expense. That cases of levity nevertheless took place, Dr. Gröne admits, but he strenuously denies that Tetzel gave cause for animadversion. Finally, the "*Instructio Summaria*" directed that all Indulgences of a particular or local kind, should be declared, in virtue of the Pope's Bull, as suspended for eight years in favour of the one now granted by his Holiness,—a declaration which did not fail to excite a bitter spirit of opposition and jealousy, especially among the religious orders and confraternities, of which Tetzel had to bear the brunt.

In the church of All Saints, at Wittenberg, there was a costly shrine of relics presented by the reigning elector Frederic, afterwards surnamed the Wise. At his request Pope Leo X., so recently as 1516, had attached to this shrine an Indulgence for the yearly festival of All Saints. The offerings which this Indulgence would produce, Frederic designed to apply for the benefit of the new university which he had founded. Hence, he regarded the Papal Indulgence for S. Peter's at Rome as a grievance, and, but for an imperial mandate requiring all the German princes to throw no impediment in its way, he would have forbidden its being preached in his territories.

Frederic, moreover, had a grudge against Rome on the following grounds. The Holy See had, in compliance with his request, consented to confer on his natural son the coadjutorship to a benefice *in commendam*. But the Commendator himself dying when the diploma conferring the coadjutorship had just been completed, a new diploma conferring the vacant commendatory had to be prepared instead, entailing on Frederic, who was of a very parsimonious disposition, the vexatious necessity of having to pay the fees twice over. This he ruminated upon in his sullen way, and set it down in his mind as a conclusive proof of that grasping, overreaching spirit which the enemies of the Church in that age accused her of in such exaggerated terms. Frederic the Wise was also involved in a dispute with the Archbishop of Mentz, respecting certain territorial rights at Erfurth.

The Augustinian hermits of Wittenberg sympathised with their munificent patron the Elector. He permitted them to make use of the funds accruing from the local indulgence of All Saints towards the expenses of a new convent and church which they had in course of erection. But the temporary suspension of the latter Indulgence in favour of the one preached by John Tetzel for Pope Leo X. and Archbishop Albert inconvenienced and annoyed them all the more, as their buildings were on the point of completion. Neither was their ill will towards Tetzel the less that, in his character as a Dominican, he was their ardent opponent in the scholastic and theological disputes of the day ; and, besides being a preacher of such talent and influence, was a dignitary of the court of Inquisition at Cologne, where, of course, the Dominicans presided.

In spite of all obstacles, Tetzel preached the Indulgence with signal success at Leipsic, Magdeburg, Halberstadt, Berlin, and other places. At length, about the end of October, 1517, he arrived at Yüterbock, near Wittenberg, just at the time for gaining the special Indulgence of All Saints. In vain the Augustinians secretly did what they could to prevent the people from flocking to hear him. The very students of the new Wittenberg university, expressly founded as it was as a rival to that of Leipsic, deserted the lecture-halls in such numbers that the professors were filled with alarm and indignation. In particular, Doctor Martin Luther was exasperated to find himself so completely eclipsed by the proximity of Tetzel, against whom he fruitlessly inveighed in the temporary church of the Augustinian hermits. Even his own penitents, regardless of his admonitions and refusals of absolution, forsook his confessional to obtain the Indulgence proclaimed at Yüterbock. All at once they seemed to forget the maxims he had taken so much pains to instil into their minds respecting Divine grace and good works ! Long had he waited for an opportunity to broach his new doctrine openly, and he and his disciples resolved that now or never was the time to do so.

Accordingly, on the 31st of October Luther posted up his famous ninety-five Theses at the door of All Saints' Church in Wittenberg, and challenged all the world to dispute with him on the doctrine they maintained. Ostensibly they were levelled against the alleged abuses of the Papal Indulgence. But attacks on the doctrine itself, as well as on the authority of the Pope, were insidiously intermingled with them.

“ Not the affair of the Indulgence, not Tetzel, not the corruption and ignorance of the clergy, not the decay of discipline,” says Dr. Gröne, “ but the

circumstance that Luther, previous to the posting up of his Theses, was a heretic, and found support in the Elector Frederic—this it was that gave rise to the great schism in the Church.”

Dr. Gröne substantiates his assertion by authenticated facts, and a critical examination of Luther's ninety-five Theses, which, says he :—

Were the point of transition from secret to open, from timid to obstinate, heresy. They were the seed which, sown in the soil, contains, not only virtually, but really, all that, as germ and plant, it has a right to contain. They were the result, the production of Luther's mental life, corroded, as it was, by error and learned self-conceit, they were as intimately united with it as the stem is with the root, therefore they could only be abandoned in case the author himself transformed his entire interior life. Hence, too, is to be derived the obstinacy with which Luther clung to them, with which he would still have clung to them, even if they had not earned him general applause ; hence the circumstance that, in defending them, he involved himself deeper and deeper in heresy.

By means of the press Luther's Theses were soon spread all over Germany. Tetzel, seeing the riotous applause they met with from the enemies of the Church generally, and from his own enemies in particular, suspended his preaching ; and, with the concurrence of the Archbishop of Mentz, repaired for advice to his former preceptor, Dr. Conrad Wimpina, at that time Rector of the University of Frankfort on the Oder. Wimpina advised him to answer Luther's challenge with a series of antitheses. Tetzel did so, and published against Luther's ninety-five Theses, a hundred and six antitheses. They obtained for him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. In the clearest manner they set forth the true Catholic doctrine of the absolute necessity of repentance, confession, and satisfaction, for the pardon of sin, affirming that though an Indulgence exempts the sinner from the vindictory penalties of the Church, it leaves him just as much bound as ever to submit to her medicinal and preservative ones ; that it does not derogate from the merits of Christ, since its whole efficacy is due to the atoning passion of Christ ; as also that the Pope has power only by means of suffrage to apply the benefits of an Indulgence to the souls in Purgatory. Moreover, to say the Pope cannot absolve the least venial sin is erroneous ; and equally so to deny that all Vicars of Christ have the same power as Peter had : rather, to assert that Peter, in the matter of Indulgences, had more power than they, is both heretical and blasphemous.

One of the many slanders on Tetzel is that he was not the author of the antitheses that he published, but that Dr. Wim-

pina wrote them for him. Luther himself flung this taunt in his face, and so gave it the *prestige* among his party of an undoubted fact. Dr. Gröne enters fully into the case, and terminates his inquiry with "venturing to believe that, by his vindication, he has annihilated every substantial ground for doubting that Tetzel was the real author of the antitheses in question." They did not, of course, silence Luther, who replied to them with a popular compendium in German of his ninety-five Theses in twenty articles. Tetzel rejoined with twenty others also in German. In the nineteenth he declares of Luther's doctrine, in the tone of a prophet, that, in consequence of it, "many people will condemn the authority and power of his Holiness the Pope and the Roman See, will intermit the works of Sacramental satisfaction, will no longer believe their pastors and teachers, but will explain, every one for himself, the sacred Scriptures according to private fancy and whim, and believe just what every one chooses, to the great detriment of souls throughout Christendom."

At a time when all the most learned men in Germany regarded the matter as nothing but a scholastic dispute, when many even in Rome deemed it a mere monkish quarrel, Tetzel, by thus pointing out in such clear and concise terms what Luther's principles really involved, what fatal results they would produce, evinced, in Dr. Gröne's opinion, a more than ordinary penetration of mind.

Luther's fundamental thought in attacking Indulgences was this: that Indulgences are not of faith, because not taught in the Bible, not taught by Christ and His Apostles; they emanate, he said, only from the Pope. Now, if this thought was an erroneous one, if the Pope in questions of faith and morals is infallible, if he alone possesses the right to decide the true sense and meaning of Scripture, every Catholic is bound on all such questions to submit to him; and Luther, if he persisted in maintaining his doctrine, passed sentence on himself as an apostate and a heretic, cut himself off from all escape, and had no other choice left than that of either being punished as a heretic, or making a recantation. Hence, in order to drive him from the field, it was requisite to prove that, besides the truths explicitly declared in Holy Writ, there are other truths in the Church which we are equally bound to believe; and that they comprise all those doctrines relating to faith which are defined as such by the Holy See. By setting up these propositions the dispute would be raised to one of principle, and Luther would be compelled to speak out on the Pope's authority in matters of faith and practice.

These considerations spurred Tetzel on to issue against Luther fifty Theses on the power of the Pope; for, indeed, it had not eluded his observation that much the greater part of the applause received by Luther was owing far more to his insidious attacks on the authority of the Holy See than to his reprobation of the Indulgence. Tetzel's fifty Theses, published about the end of April, 1518, maintained, therefore, that the highest power having been received by the Pope exclusively from God, cannot be extended or limited, either by any man, or by the whole world, but only by God Alone. That in his power of jurisdiction the Pope stands above all other bishops separate or united. That, although, as a private man, the Pope may hold, on a point of faith, a wrong opinion, yet when he pronounces judgment on it *ex cathedrâ* he is infallible. That Indulgences cannot be granted by the rest of the prelates, whether collectively or singly, but only by the "Bridegroom of the whole Church," viz., the Pope. That what is true and of faith about Indulgences, only the Pope can decide. That the Church has many Catholic truths, which are neither expressly declared in the canon of Scripture, nor explicitly stated by the holy Fathers. That all doctrines relating to faith, and defined as such by the Apostolic See, are to be reckoned among Catholic truths, whether or no they are contained in the Bible. As a warning for the Elector of Saxony, Tetzel declares that all those who patronize heretics, and use their power to prevent them from being put upon their trial before the lawful judge, incur excommunication.

These fifty Theses of Tetzel's were strictly in the spirit of the scholastic theology in vogue, a spirit which the experience of such councils as those of Basle, Constance, and Florence had contributed not a little to evoke.

Luther at once perceived what a stumbling-block Tetzel had thrown in his way. He did not attempt to dispute the fifty Theses. Had he done so he must have plainly acknowledged himself a heretic. As matters stood, this would have been premature, would have spoiled all, would have ruined him and his cause. Tetzel had not designated Luther personally as a heretic. But Luther chose to assume that he had done so, and forthwith let loose a storm against him of such brutal and malignant invective as Luther alone was capable of. Adopting the tone of an injured man, a man shamefully misunderstood, he filled Germany with hypocritical asseverations of his orthodoxy and his devotion to the See of Peter. All his party, all Tetzel's opponents, followed in his wake. The heathen-minded Humanists, in particular, singled out Tetzel

as the butt of their ribald satire, holding him up to scorn and execration as the very impersonation of every imaginable monastic abuse and scandal. The persecuted man found little or no shelter from the tempest. The friends of religion and the Church were intimidated, confounded, paralysed; apathy, indecision, cowardice, delusion, prevailed among the guardians of the faith, prevailed among the German bishops. Rome herself was slow and lenient in her measures. Although she cited Luther to come and answer for himself to her, she consented, in the persons of Cajetan and Miltiz, to go to him. Cajetan, all patience and condescension, allowed himself to be trifled with and duped. Miltiz truckled to Luther, reviled Tetzel, betrayed his trust. In vain did Hermann Rab, Provincial of the Saxon Dominicans, address a touching letter in Tetzel's defence to Miltiz. It is dated at Leipzig, January 3, 1519, and is quoted in full by Dr. Gröne:—

Truly I should not know where to find a man (observes Hermann Rab in this letter) who has done and suffered, who still suffers so much for the honour of the Apostolic See, as our venerable father, Magister John Tetzel. If his Holiness only knew it, I doubt not but that he would distinguish him in a worthy manner. With what lies and slanders beyond number he is overwhelmed, all the street corners, where they resound in your ears, attest. I only wish your Excellence had heard the sermon he preached on the feast of our Lord's Circumcision, for then you would not have failed to convince yourself what his sentiments are, and always have been, towards the Holy See.

Miltiz commanded Tetzel to retire to his cell at Leipsic. He obeyed. His career was now terminated. He never ascended the pulpit again. The fatigues and excitement he had undergone; the persecution he suffered; his deserted and forlorn condition; above all, the course of events, so ominous for the Church and the Papacy, to which he clung with all his soul; these things preyed upon his mind and body to such a degree that his health gave way, and he died in a state of profound melancholy in the month of August of the above-mentioned year. He is supposed to have been about sixty years old.

Tetzel could not have set up a better monument to his own character (writes Dr. Gröne) than he did in the grief and affliction which hastened his end. The ruin of the Church, the wild infidelity, and unspeakable disorders which the triumph of Luther must needs entail on Germany,—this was the worm that gnawed his vital thread. It broke his heart to be forced to see how the sincere champions of the old Church truths were left alone, were slandered, despised, and misunderstood by their own party, while the mockers and revilers of the immutable doctrine won applause on all sides.



In a chapter devoted to a refutation of the infamous calumnies and profane anecdotes recorded of Tetzel, it is shown by Dr. Grüne that they were mostly borrowed from the Decameron of Boccaccio and a congenial German production, styled, *Der Pfaffe Amis*. For example,—Tetzel, being anxious to impart extraordinary interest to the indulgence he had to preach, once told the people he would show them a feather which the devil, in combating with the archangel Michael, had plucked from the archangel's wing. But a couple of godless wags, entering his chamber during his absence, stole the feather out of the box in which it was kept, and put some coals from the fire-place in its stead. Tetzel, ignorant of the theft, mounts the pulpit, box in hand, and declaims with great fervour on the wonderful qualities of his heavenly feather. Then opening the box, finds it full of coals. Nothing abashed, he cries out, "What wonder if, among so many relic-boxes as I possess, I have taken the wrong one." And forthwith he extols the miraculous power of the very coals on which S. Lawrence was broiled.

Another merry tale of the sort is the following:—"Tetzel," they say, "once desired to lodge with the sacristan at Zwickau. But the sacristan excused himself as being too poor to entertain so renowned a guest. 'We'll see that you have money enough,' said Tetzel, 'only look what saint it is in the calendar to-morrow.' The sacristan found the name of Juvenalis. 'A very unlucky name, he regretted to say, because it was so little known.' 'But we'll make it known,' replied Tetzel. 'Ring the bells to-morrow as if for a festival, and let High Mass be sung.' The sacristan obeyed, and the people throng the church. After the Gospel Tetzel ascends the pulpit, and speaks:—"Good people, to-day I have something to tell you which, if I were to withhold it, would be the very ruin of your salvation. Hitherto, you know, we have always invoked such and such saints, but now they have grown old, and are tired of hearing and helping us. To-day you commemorate Juvenalis, and although till now he has been unknown, let us none the less honour him with all our hearts. For as he is a new saint, he will be all the more indefatigable in praying for us. Juvenalis, my friends, was a holy martyr, whose blood was innocently shed. Now if you also would participate in his innocence before God, let each of you put an offering on the altar during Mass. And do you, ye great and rich ones, precede the rest with your good example.'"

Again, in 1512, Tetzel, after having preached at Zwickau, had got all his money packed up, and was about to depart. But the parish priest, with his chaplain and clerk, came

running to him, bitterly complaining that, while he had provided so splendidly for himself, they had not got as much by the Indulgence as would pay for one jolly day. "Truly I am very sorry," answers Tetzel, "but why did you not tell me sooner? However, ring the bells again to-morrow; there may still, perhaps, be something left for you." No sooner said than done. The people all came flocking to church, and Tetzel, ascending the pulpit, begins—"Dearly beloved, true I had intended to depart this very day, but last night I heard in your church-yard a poor soul moaning and weeping miserably, and imploring some one to come to her relief, and deliver her out of Purgatory. This caused me to remain here to-day, to have Mass said and offerings made for this poor soul. Now, whoever among us should neglect to make an offering would thereby prove that he has no compassion on the poor soul, or else that he must either be a fornicator or an adulterer, whose conscience tells him he is not worthy to take part in this good work. And that you may know what an urgent case it is I myself will be the first to present my offering."

Of course all the people hasten to follow so edifying an example, they even borrow money from one another, for no one wishes to be thought a fornicator or an adulterer.

In citing such absurd stories as the above, along with many others of a still more profane description, Dr. Gröne shows that, in several instances, they were the same as were employed to slander the character of Bernardin Samson, the Franciscan preacher of Pope Leo's Indulgence in Switzerland. He also cites two contemporary documents, one of them signed by the authorities of the town of Halle, the other by John Pels, prior of the Dominican convent of Nevenwerk, denying in emphatic terms, that Tetzel, in his sermons, ever blasphemed the Blessed Virgin in the shocking way he was accused of doing. In fine, had he really been the monster of depravity, the shameless drunkard, swindler, liar, blasphemer, and adulterer his enemies make of him, it is but too obvious that, instead of opposing, he would have joined Luther, whose earliest and most ardent disciples were principally degenerate monks, in love with the Lutheran doctrine of the futility of good works;—monks, in a word, corresponding in every respect to the Protestant descriptions, but opposite in character as day and night to the true nature of John Tetzel.



## ART. III.—LORD PLUNKET'S LIFE AND SPEECHES.

*The Life, Letters, and Speeches of Lord Plunket.* By his Grandson the Hon. DAVID PLUNKET. With an Introductory Preface by Lord BROUGHAM. 2 vols. London : Smith & Elder. 1867.

*Speeches at the Bar and in the Senate.* By the Right Hon. LORD PLUNKET, Lord High Chancellor of Ireland. Edited, with a Memoir and Historical Notices, by JOHN CASHEL HOEY. Dublin : Duffy. 1856.

THE publication of the materials of history in the correspondence and speeches of eminent men, is one of the characteristics of our times. Mr. Plunket's work which has just appeared, partakes of this character. It contains a considerable number of highly interesting and valuable letters, which form the most original part of his volumes. In this respect it could not be expected to compete with those which give us the letters and despatches of the illustrious general of our age, or again of great administrators like the Marquis of Wellesley or Lord Cornwallis, for the most important years of Plunket's life were spent in a private station. His own letters, moreover, which, although they could not have equalled in historical importance those written by men in high official situations, could not have failed to be highly interesting, have in few instances been preserved, or at least have not been accessible to his biographer. There are interesting and important letters of his, some of which we shall mention; but the most important in the volume were not received by him. Among these we have read those of Lord Wellesley with especial interest. His public life was always distinguished by something of almost monarchical stateliness. His private letters to Plunket, when the two were united, as Lord Lieutenant and Attorney General, in a struggle against the bigotry of their colleagues in administration, present him in a new character. He complains of the treatment he received from the English Government, in language more forcible than dignified. March 19, 1824, he writes :—

This country is in the most tremendous condition, and I am left without support or countenance to submit to the kicks of the ass and the dirt of the monkey. The suppression of my despatch on this great subject is an ignominy, an insult not to be endured. It is a sequel of the same plan of extinction which on the questions of the Statue, the Riot, the Orange and Ribbon con-

federacies, by concealing my opinions, reduced me to the condition of a villain and slave on a mock throne, and rendered me an object of ridicule and contempt to a country which would have hailed me with respect and gratitude if I had not been crushed by pretended candour at Whitehall. This letter is entirely for your most secret consideration, and in the bosom of friendship I think it right to impart to you my fixed resolution . . . which it would not be kind to conceal from so affectionate and respected a friend . . . I am indeed most unhappy here—degraded, vilified, an object of scorn and detestation without protection or even care ; anxious to save the country, able to save it as far as relates to my own powers, frustrated, baffled, and betrayed by all my own agents, encompassed by traitors even at my own table, the whole machinery of my own government working to my destruction ; and in England not the slightest symptom of a disposition to give me support or credit, but a contemptuous silence even of my name, and a contemptuous if not treacherous suppression of my communications on the most important affairs of government. From such a condition I pant for a release (ii. 146).

No trace of this state of feeling, or of the events which produced it, is to be found in the three volumes of the “*Memoirs and Correspondence*” of the Marquis Wellesley.

There are also many interesting political letters of the leaders of the Grenville party, with which Plunket was so long connected, Lord Grenville, the Marquis of Buckingham, Mr. Wynn, and others.

When William Conyngham Plunket was born, and even in the earlier years of his manhood, it seemed little likely that his name or memory should ever be mixed up with the stately titles of the leaders of aristocratic English parties. His elevation was obviously assisted by those unjust laws which he devoted his life to sweep away : for they excluded the mass of his countrymen from all competition for the prizes of a free State ; but it was due to his natural talents and energy, which, we doubt not, would have raised him to the top, let the competition have been what it might.

He was born five years later than Pitt, and five earlier than Wellington, on July 1, 1764. The Peerages grace his father with an ancient and illustrious genealogy, traced through the Barons of Louth to one of the earliest followers of Strongbow. He was a Socinian preacher,—during the earlier years of his children stationed at the historical little town of Enniskillen, and afterwards at the “*Strand Street Chapel in Dublin, the wealthiest and most influential Dissenting congregation in Ireland.*” Of the old preacher, little record has been preserved beyond the fact that his society was sought by “*the Dublin politicians, courtiers, and men of eminence in the learned professions, without distinction of party or creed ;*” and that “*a*

comfortable seat in the gallery of the Irish House of Commons was always by courtesy allowed to him, which long after his death was known as Dr. Plunket's stall." The success of the sons was remarkable. The youngest won his way to the Peerage and the woolsack; the eldest left to him £60,000, made by his practice as a physician in Dublin; and the second, after serving with distinction under Washington in the War of Independence, realized as a merchant in the United States above £40,000, half of which he left to Lord Plunket. But he who succeeded in making his own fortune and doing more than any one other man to clear his country, by merely constitutional means, from the taint of injustice, did not, according to Mr. Plunket, succeed in rescuing the bequest from "the knavery of an attorney employed by him to recover it."

The volumes before us give hardly any account of Plunket's private life. There is probably not a great deal preserved. The biographer was a child when his illustrious ancestor retired into private life, and later he was subject to the most humiliating of all the calamities under which a great man can suffer, a rapid and total loss of intellect, which left him far more inferior to ordinary men than he had ever risen above them. Still, one would have thought that something more might have been said on this subject. The personal character of distinguished men, the aspect they present to their family and friends, the higher aspirations of their souls, their belief (or opinions, as the case may be) as to things unseen, are so important a part of themselves, that we can hardly be said to possess a life or picture of the man if these are wholly omitted. Yet the "Life" by his grandson really gives us little insight into this whole side of Plunket's character. For instance, he resigned the seals when only seventy-five, and the biographer says that the failure of his intellectual powers came on when near ninety; yet these fifteen years are dismissed in eighteen lines. The period during which, with a short exception, he withdrew from imperial politics, between 1801 and 1813, is even more briefly treated. The biographer has evidently been prevented by high and delicate feelings from collecting whatever might still be preserved of his ancestor's private life. Beyond tracing his public career, therefore, we are obliged to content ourselves with scanty and imperfect indications.

We regret this the more, because what we have gives us a much more pleasing idea of Plunket's private character than we believe to have been common even among those who have most admired his talents and political career. He was fourteen when his father died. At that age his maternal uncle, a bene-

ficed clergyman of the Irish Establishment, writes a letter which he "preserved evidently with great care," congratulating him on "the uncommon friendship of Counsellor Yelverton. I doubt not of your retaining a grateful sense of it. I must repeat it, his friendship is uncommon." It is probable that this early patronage decided the whole course of the boy's future life; for, as Mr. Plunket says—

Counsellor Yelverton here mentioned was the celebrated Barry Yelverton, then one of the ablest advocates and most stirring politicians at the Irish Bar. He was afterwards Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and in 1795 Baron Avonmore. He had been the admirer and intimate friend of the Rev. Mr. Plunket, and his own son, who was of the same age as William Plunket, attended with him the day-school then kept in Dublin by the Rev. Lewis Kerr. A schoolboy friendship sprang up between the lads, which Yelverton's father took pains to encourage. He often invited young Plunket to his house, questioned him as to his studies, and encouraged him to adopt with confidence the profession of the law, which he intended his son should also follow. It has been recorded of William Plunket by one who sometimes met him on these occasions at the house of Mr. Yelverton, that he was a "clever, hard-headed boy, very attentive to his books and very negligent of his person." In 1779 Yelverton and Plunket, who had both just attained the age of fifteen, became students of the University of Dublin, Plunket taking a high place at the entrance examination (i. 29).

This is all we know of Plunket before he entered the University. There he obtained a scholarship, but does not seem to have sat for a fellowship. Probably his law studies prevented his giving the necessary time to preparing for the examination. He was, however, a distinguished member of the "Historical Society," a debating club which contains upon its rolls almost every name that for a century has become illustrious in the learned professions or in the literature of Ireland, and still subsists in vigour within the walls of "old Trinity." Its foundations had been laid in the year 1747 by "the illustrious Edmund Burke and five others." The minutes of their proceedings are still extant in the handwriting of Burke, and are in the possession of Judge Berwick. In 1770 this Society, though entirely composed of students in the University, and attended by Grattan Yelverton and Hussey Burgh, held its meetings outside the college walls. In 1777 it was established within the walls as "the Historical Society" to cultivate history, oratory, and composition. It was so much prized that some of its members used still to take part in its debates after they had been admitted to the Irish Parliament, and those still students frequented the gallery of the House. Plunket was admitted to the Society

in the eventful year 1782, in which the Irish volunteers, under the guidance of Grattan, extorted from the British Government the absolute independence of the Irish Parliament and Government; so that for eighteen years the only legal and acknowledged connection between England and Ireland was that the two crowns were held by the same Sovereign.

It seems strange that any statesmen should have imagined that England and Ireland could permanently remain prosperous and united under such a system. It may well be doubted whether any two kingdoms, large and powerful enough to have more than municipal interests and relations, can pull together in double harness of this sort, unless the reins are held in the firm grasp of a despot. In that case the duality is merely nominal; for both are ruled and directed by the same will. Such was the union of Poland and Russia from 1815 to 1830. Sweden and Norway for the last forty years have been almost or wholly without foreign relations. That Hungary and Austria may prosper under the new system we must all heartily desire; but the experiment has not yet been tried. But, leaving generalities, it is the peculiar national character of Englishmen never to rest in any country where they are established until they are masters of it. Then the Irish had so strong an antipathy to the English that they would never have worked together, even on the fairest terms; and lastly, the English feeling about the bugbear of "Popery" would alone have made impossible any hearty co-operation of the two as really independent nations. How, as a matter of fact, they did go on for eighteen years is notorious. The Parliament and Government which went side by side with those of England were not those of the Irish nation, but of the Orange faction, which, standing with its feet upon the neck of Ireland, depended upon English aid to prevent or avenge any attempt to rise or break her fetters. Besides employing the strength of England in this inglorious hangman's work, the dominant faction demanded and obtained payment for following the will of the English Minister—places, peerages, pensions, and bribes in hard cash were the price of their subjection. Mr. Plunket quotes (from Massey's History) a private report made to the English Government in 1784, showing that the English Government could reckon upon 186 votes in the Irish House of Commons. Of these 116 were nomination seats, "the owners of which had let them out in consideration of titles, offices, and pensions in possession or expectancy;" twelve were Government borough seats, 44 placemen, 32 "gentlemen who had promises, or who had avowed their expectations of favours and qualifications" (? gratifications).

Lastly—

There were twelve members not registered in the Secretaries' books, as demanding either peerages, places, or pensions, and therefore set down as supporting Government on independent grounds. Besides these there was a party of twenty-nine, who, though willing to cultivate private intercourse with the Ministers, affected, and sometimes asserted, an independent opposition in the House. The regular opposition appears to have been limited to 82. Of these 30 were the nominees of Whig proprietors, and 52 represented the popular party.\*

But of this "popular party" it was only a few, eminent for political wisdom, who were for doing any justice to the people of Ireland. The rest were for maintaining the rights of the Spartans, not for relieving the lot of the Helots. We are expressly told in the volume before us (p. 69, vol. i.) that the Earl of Charlemont, the leader of the "popular party," was opposed to all concession to the Catholics, not only when he headed the volunteers in their demands for the independence of Ireland, but even as late as 1798, when he returned Plunket for the borough from which he took his title. It was not until 1799, the year in which "he died broken-hearted at the degradation of the Parliament with which he associated so much of glorious and happy memories, and the annihilation of an independence for whose achievement a national army had once assembled under his command," that, after a long interview with Plunket, he said to his son, "Plunket has prevailed over an old prejudice."

Strange, indeed, that any statesman should have succeeded in shutting his eyes to the glaring absurdity of a "popular party" which, solely as a measure of religious persecution,

\* This curious statement is from the Bolton MSS. Mr. Massey quotes some entries "at random."

H. H., son-in-law to Lord A——, and brought into Parliament by him, studies law, and wishes to be commissioner of barracks, or in some similar place. Would go into orders and take a living.

H. D., brother to Lord C——, applied for an office; but, as no specific promise could be made, has lately voted in opposition; easy to be had, if thought expedient. A silent, gloomy man.

L. M., refuses to accept £500 *per annum*; states very high pretensions from his skill in House of Commons' management: expects £1,000 *per annum*. N.B.—Be careful of him.

T. N. has been in the army, and is now on half pay. Wishes a troop of dragoons in full pay. States his pretensions to be fifteen years' service in Parliament. N.B.—Would prefer office to military promotion, but already has, and has long had, a pension. Especially on the side of truth not favourable.

R. P., independent, but well disposed to Government. His four sisters have pensions; his object is a living for his brother.



excluded from political liberty three-fourths of the nation whose liberties it professed to defend, including men of large property, men of ancient family, men of high rank, men of professional eminence, men of high education, men of unblemished character : and which could believe that so manifest a sham could long continue to exist before the face of the sun. Henry Grattan, the founder of the independence of Ireland, was not thus blinded. He did not see, what seems so plain to us, that a free and independent Parliament really representing the Irish nation must soon have come into collision with the English Parliament, and that civil war would have been the only possible result ; but he did see that a little band of tyrants trampling upon their fellow-countrymen, though they might be the instruments and tools of the English nation, could not long be its equals and rivals. He strove to stem the tide of corruption and tyranny, and to open to the Irish nation access to the free State, of which he was the founder. When he found all his efforts unavailing, he retired in disgust from public life, and buried himself in the lovely scenes of his villa among the Wicklow mountains. He felt what he afterwards declared in the Parliament at Westminster “when the Irish Parliament rejected the Catholic petition, on that day, she voted the Union. Many good and pious reasons she gave, and she lies there with her many good and her pious reasons.”

But in 1782, when Plunket became a member of the Historical Society, and an eager witness of the parliamentary debates, even statesmen such as Grattan anticipated for the Parliament of Ireland a career of glory. What wonder if the young student caught the enthusiasm. This must be borne in mind, if we would do justice to his feelings eighteen years later.

His undergraduate years went rapidly by. He was specially distinguished in the debates of his fellow-students, and his biographer wisely publishes what has been preserved of his early speeches, which it is in several ways interesting to compare with those of his later life. He left the college with a store of classical taste and accomplishments which were a fund of pleasure through his whole life : and even in old age “it particularly pleased him to cap quotations from the great Greek and Latin authors with those who were fresh from school and college studies, a competition in which he was always successful.” Even more important, perhaps, in his profession and in Parliament was the diligent practice with which he had cultivated his natural talent for oratory. Another acquisition of almost greater value he made in Trinity College ; a store of friends,

already remarkable for talents, industry, and promise, almost all of whom rose to eminent stations, and lived to old age.

Those especially mentioned are,—Bushe, afterwards Lord Chief Justice, who survived till 1843; Peter Burrowes, also a successful lawyer, who died 1841; Miller, afterwards a clergyman; Magee, predecessor of Whately as Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, and celebrated for his work on the Atonement; Parsons, afterwards Earl of Rosse, and father to the present Earl, “of astronomical reputation;” and the too well-known name of Theobald Wolfe Tone. Few possessions are more precious than such early friendships, and many men feel the sacrifice of such friendships when required by duty one of the hardest to which they can be called.

In our own time and country there are many men by whom the sacrifice is felt deeply, though silently, every hour of every day. Perhaps there is hardly one of those who have followed the call of Grace into the Catholic Church who does not painfully feel in this sense the dying words of Hotspur, “Thou hast robbed me of my youth.” Perhaps the yearning heart in which dwelt the lionlike soul of Saul of Tarsus felt the same pain when he wrote, “The things that were gain to me the same I counted loss for Christ. I count all things but loss for the excellent knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them but as dung that I may gain Christ.” In spite of mortality and change it was Plunket’s singular happiness to retain to old age a whole cluster of the friends he made at college. Almost the only exception was the able and accomplished enthusiast Tone, who was soon severed from him by the overwhelming tide of revolutionary conspiracies, and died in prison, prematurely, and by his own hand. To Magee he was bound by the closest ties. They began life, says Mr. Plunket, rather as twins than as strangers, for their parents lived next door to each other in Enniskillen, and each was at times nursed at the breast of his friend’s mother. They played together at school, and studied together in college; and in old age, as Lord Chancellor of Ireland and Archbishop in the Irish Establishment, they once more occupied adjoining houses in the great Square of Dublin. At this time when Plunket had to propose the health of Magee at a public dinner, he hesitated, and then, seeming to overcome all embarrassment, he began: “I feel as if I were about to pronounce a panegyric upon myself when I speak of my friend to the left, there has been such a oneness between us that we have scarcely had a separate existence.” In their long lives they are said to have had only “one short quarrel, complete while



it lasted, but forgiven and bitterly regretted by both." Mr. Plunket says—

The following touching circumstance was told me by Mrs. Margaret Hunter, the eldest and favourite child of the Archbishop. I give it in her own words :—

"The last time I visited Old Connaught I took my eldest boy to see Lord Plunket, and he took us with him to see the pleasure grounds and garden. As we walked and conversed, he stopped short, facing me, and said, 'Margaret, your father would *once* have sacrificed his life for me.' I replied, 'My Lord, I think he would have done so to the last hour of his life.' He paused, with his hands behind his back, as his custom was, and looking full in my face, he said, 'Margaret, I treated your father very badly,' and tears dropped heavily upon his shoes. I replied, 'Well, my Lord, he forgave you and loved you to the last, and trusted to meet you again where that quarrel might all be forgotten.' He said, with solemn emphasis, 'God grant it, God grant it.' I never saw him again, as he was forbidden to converse with me, so much did it agitate him to refer to those bygone days" (vol. i., p. 257).

We know so little of the man, and so much of the politician, that it would have been a loss, indeed, had so beautiful a gleam of personal character been unrecorded.

College days are but too soon over. While Magee was studying for his fellowship, Plunket was keeping term at Lincoln's Inn (for the Irish Bar required a year's terms to have been kept in London) and studying "*Fearne on Contingent Remainders.*" His pecuniary difficulties tempted him to leave the law for some less ambitious, but more quickly remunerating pursuit, but he was courageously backed by his noble-hearted sisters. His sister Catharine, when forcing on him a small loan of money, which he had at first refused, insists that he shall repay her with heavy interest "as soon as he is Attorney-General, as she expects he will be speedily." His progress was what, at least in our days, would be reckoned uncommonly quick. He was called to the bar in January, 1787, and in June wrote to a friend: "I made my first public exhibition a fortnight ago in the Court of Exchequer, and gained a good deal of credit by it. I have some prospect of being employed next winter in a business of some consequence before the Lords in which I am to be the sole counsel; on the whole, I find myself likely to get business much faster than I had any right to expect."

We must hasten over the years of his practice. He pleaded before a committee of the Irish House of Commons on the university election. The Provost Hutchinson, founder of the Donoughmore family, had used the influence of his official situation to force his son into Parliament by very gross intimi-

dation and corruption. It is curious to find that one exercise of his power was to force the future Archbishop Magee to undergo the ceremony of ordination by a Protestant bishop against his will. Magee applied to the provost for a dispensation to enable him to go to the bar. It was refused by Hutchinson "*from a sense of duty*," and then offered, together with other privileges, producing about £100 *per annum*, on condition of his breaking his promise to the other candidate, and voting for the provost's son. There were worse cases still. The committee consisted of fourteen. One was unable to attend. Of the remaining thirteen, seven were for unseating Mr. Hutchinson, and six the other way. But the chairman was one of the minority, and by Act of Parliament had power to vote in the place of the absent member. He thus made the votes seven against seven, and then gave his casting vote. Thus the chairman preserved the seat of the provost's son by giving three votes. This committee sat in 1791. It is interesting, because among its members were two young aristocrats of promise, both of whom voted against corruption. One was Lord Edward Fitzgerald; the other, Arthur Wesley (as he then wrote his name), whose body sixty-one years later was borne in funeral pomp from Chelsea Hospital to Saint Paul's. So rapid was Plunket's rise that only ten years after his call to the bar he received a silk gown from Lord Chancellor Clare, and afterwards practised chiefly in the Courts of Equity.

In 1798 he was returned to the Irish Parliament for the close borough of Charlemont. Its patron, the celebrated earl who took his title from it, differed from him on the question of Catholic Emancipation, but the movement brought into prominence other subjects upon which they were cordially one. Plunket took his seat February 6th, and the rebellion broke out almost immediately afterwards. It was hardly suppressed when the proposal for a union was made, in vehement opposition to which Plunket won his parliamentary fame.

He has been most unjustly condemned by men who, knowing that he had first distinguished himself as a politician by the extreme violence as well as power with which he tore in pieces this most important measure of a Tory Government, and that in future life he was distinguished as a Conservative politician, have hastily concluded that he was a political apostate. Of his private feelings, we have already said, less is known than in the case of most politicians. His public conduct seems to have been quite consistent. It is plain that he had been from his earliest years what would now be called a Liberal

Conservative, or at least what would have been so called a few months back, before Mr. Disraeli had succeeded in throwing all parties and all principles into utter confusion. In his own days he would have been called a Constitutional Whig. In a word, he was, both politically and intellectually, a disciple of the ever-illustrious Edmund Burke. Young as he was when he entered the Irish Parliament, he had shown this long before. "Long before Tone was obliged to leave Ireland," says Mr. Cashel Hoey, the political opposition between him and Plunket "had even bred a personal estrangement between the two friends." Tone wrote in his journal at Paris, "My friend Plunket (but I sincerely forgive him) and my friend Magee, whom I have not yet forgiven, would not speak to me in Ireland, because I was a Republican." The "boy" of the Historical Society was "father to the man" who supported Government in the debates on the "Peterloo Massacre," and the war against Napoleon on his return from Elba. But the Union was an exceptional question. Writing in England in 1867, it is easy enough to see that it was a matter of necessity. At the time Sir Arthur Wellesley wrote from India "there must be no more debating societies in Ireland" (vol. i., p. 100). But both the measure itself, and still more the means by which it was carried, must have been inexpressibly loathsome to any tolerably sanguine and honest Irishman, and more especially to one like Plunket, a rising member of the Irish Bar. His patriotic feelings must have been excited to the utmost, and concentrated not on the great British empire, but upon Ireland; for his interest in politics began in the year 1782, when—

The members of the Historical Society were night after night listening to the eloquence and sharing the enthusiasm with which Henry Grattan and his associates stirred the Irish people to assert their independent nationality. They saw an army of 90,000 volunteers assemble and line the streets of Dublin through which the patriot members walked to their regenerated assembly; and while every Irishman of ardent imagination regarded these events as the beginning of a meridian age of independence and prosperity, none foresaw the future of humiliation and disaster which closed the history of the last century in Ireland (vol. i., p. 84).

And whoever might gain or lose by the Union, it deprived, at a single stroke, the rising members of the Dublin Bar of society, position, and prospects, such as perhaps no other persons in Ireland had to lose. Plunket had just attained the position in which he could place himself in the first rank as a politician, without interrupting the professional career in which he was already earning a magnificent fortune. Suddenly it was proposed

that henceforth every Irishman who could devote himself to politics, and chose to do so, must do it at a distance which it then often took a fortnight to traverse. Dublin was to be deserted by its most educated and wealthiest men and women, and every Irishman who intended to rise at the Bar must not only abandon parliamentary life himself, but must reside in what was to become, not the centre of political life, but merely a great provincial town of the British empire. No wonder the rising lawyers were ready to oppose the Union to the death. But more than this, it was pressed forward by open corruption. Ireland had been governed by mere corruption ever since 1782; for, in truth, as things then were, the only alternative was that it should not be governed at all. The rebellion just crushed had thrown an unexampled amount of power into the hands of the Government; and as it seemed likely that men who valued everything at what it would fetch in the market, would sell the fee-simple of political power for a very few years' purchase of the bribes which were required year by year to keep them in order, even men who detested bribery were willing to make one great expenditure upon it, in order to be rid for ever from the necessity of buying the votes of an Orange Parliament.

Not only had [the Parliament] earned the contempt of the people, but its own internal corruption had nearly been brought to perfection. Even since 1785 [when the return we have already quoted had been made to the English Government], considerable additions had been made to the patronage available for political purposes. Fifteen new Parliamentary places were created in 1789; five Treasury places in 1793; and some thirty-two militia colonelcies, and thirty-two county judgeships. Besides all this, the secession of Henry Grattan from the House of Commons had removed almost the last obstacle to the absolute will of the Minister. To such a condition had the country come, and to such a state had Parliament been brought, when Pitt sent over Lord Cornwallis to Ireland to offer with one hand a policy of conciliation to the people, but with the other to thrust the Act of Union on the House of Commons. However submissive the Legislature had become on all points that concerned only the interests of the people at large, it was certain that they would show some spirit on the question of their own existence (vol. i., p. 113).

It is sickening to read the accounts of the gross open bribery and the brutal intimidation by which the measure was carried. As to violence, Lord Cornwallis, who felt like an Englishman and a nobleman, described what was going on in the country of which he was the chief ruler, and which yet he was unable to prevent or punish.

All is trifling compared to the numberless murders that are hourly com-

mitted by our people without any process or examination whatever. The yeomanry are in the style of the Loyalists in America, only much more numerous and powerful, and a thousand times more ferocious. They have served their country, but now they take the lead in rapine and murder. The Irish militia, with few officers, and those chiefly of the worst kind, follow close on the heels of the yeomanry in murder and every kind of atrocity; and the fencibles take a share, though much behindhand, with the others. . . . The conversation of the principal persons of the country all tends to encourage this system of blood; and the conversation, even at my table, where you will suppose I do all I can to prevent it, always turns on hanging, shooting, &c. And if a priest has been put to death, the greatest joy is expressed by the whole company. So much for Ireland and my wretched situation (vol. i., p. 73).

The details of cases given by Lord Cornwallis most clearly prove that this language was anything but exaggerated.

As to corruption, we have only too much proof in the volume before us. Members of Parliament were bought so openly that Mr. Trench, afterwards Lord Ashtown, and grandfather to the present Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, voted for the measure at the close of the debate in which he had spoken against it. The bargain for his sale had been made while the debate went on.

What wonder that Plunket spoke vehemently against the measure. Others were as vehement as he. Saurin, at that time head of the Irish Bar, and who as Attorney-General from 1807 to 1821 was practically the governor of Ireland in the Tory interest, and ruled it with a rod of iron—Saurin called together the lawyers' Volunteers—of which he had been made commander some years before, "on the ground of his well-known loyalty and discretion as a grave constitutional lawyer"—for the express purpose of proposing that they should call upon the yeomanry throughout the kingdom to pledge themselves to oppose to the last a legislative Union. All that was really without parallel in Plunket was the power and eloquence with which he opposed, what others opposed with as much or even with greater violence. So absolutely did he place himself at the head of the opposition to the Union that when Grattan (who had been elected for Wicklow while the debate was going on) entered the House; when, "his form emaciated by sickness, and his face worn with anxiety, his limbs tottering, and leaning upon his friends Arthur Moore and George Ponsonby, he advanced slowly to the table;" when the whole House, including the Minister whom he came there to oppose, had stood up uncovered while the venerable patriot took the oaths, and he had to select a seat; the aged man chose the place next to the young barrister who had been a boy when

he won his laurels, and who had entered Parliament for the first time only the year before.

We shall refer our readers to the volumes of his grandson and Mr. Cashel Hoey for the speeches by which Plunket made his Parliamentary renown. Those of his early hearers who heard him in later days were wont to say that he never surpassed the eloquence and power with which he reasoned and inveighed against the Union. For of his speaking the definition given of that of Demosthenes was strictly descriptive—it was argument red hot with passion. The Union was carried.

Dublin, lately the centre of so much political excitement, wore an aspect of melancholy calm. The Houses of Parliament in College Green were closed. The Lords and Commons who had kept up fashionable town-houses, and whose carriages had lately thronged the streets, sold off their mansions and broke up their establishments. Of these the few who could afford to do so migrated to London, but the greater number retired to their country seats, and a deep despondency settled upon all whose circumstances compelled them to remain behind; for it was felt that Dublin had fallen from being the capital of Ireland, to the position of a provincial town of the British Empire. It may easily be imagined how unhappy were the circumstances in which the old patriotic party then found themselves. Grattan retired wholly from public life. He had a beautiful country place, Tinnehinch, situated on the borders of the counties of Dublin and Wicklow, just where the river Dargle comes rushing down from the Powerscourt Waterfall. There he lived with his own family, declining all political correspondence, and only seeing a few of those who had stood by him in the last bitter struggle. Plunket was at that time one of the most frequent of his visitors, for already had begun an intimacy which ever grew with the growth of their mutual respect until twenty years later Plunket received from the dying hand of his great patron that magnificent bequest, the conduct of the Catholic cause. . . . It is not difficult to imagine with what gloomy despair he must have seen the accomplishment of the Act of Union. It was for the time a total eclipse of his political ambition. Indeed, his first instinct was to renew a canvass of the electors of Dublin University, which he had commenced while the Irish Parliament was still in existence, with the avowed object of seeking for an immediate repeal of the measure. In a few weeks, however, he abandoned the idea, unable to resist the logic of accomplished facts. . . . A large family was growing up around him. He turned his back resolutely upon the brilliant scenes in which he had lately taken a part, and applied himself intensely to the details of a lawyer's life (vol. i., pp. 199-204).

In this capacity he was engaged in the prosecution of the unhappy Robert Emmett in 1803. For undertaking this, and for his speech on the evidence, he has been condemned as an apostate from his own former principles, assailing those who dared to act on them. No charge could be more false. In condemning Emmett's attempt he was but publicly



acting upon the principles which he had always held, and which had urged him, long before he was a public man, to break off even his private acquaintance with Tone. It is owing to utterly unfounded charges like this that most men have a vague suspicion that Plunket was an interested time-server—a suspicion to be explained only by the influence which malice is apt to gain in addressing ignorance. It is true that if dirt enough is thrown some is sure to stick. Mr. Cashel Hoey, who blames his speaking against Emmett, says in the generous tone habitual to him :—

Those who, like Cobbett, hated Plunket's party or person, declared that Emmett attacked Plunket from the dock—which was a lie ; that Plunket had been under the deepest obligations to Emmett's father and brother—which was also a lie ; and that Emmett declared he had imbibed the opinions for which he was suffering from Plunket's teaching ; opinions now abandoned by Plunket from corrupt motives. This also is an assertion equally without foundation.

The fact, as stated by his grandson, is that Plunket had never so much as seen the prisoner. Nor is there the slightest ground to suspect his sincerity in declaring that he undertook the charge being “ of opinion that it would be of some service to the public that he should avail himself of the public opportunity of speaking to the evidence at the trial by pointing out the folly and wildness as well as the wickedness of the conspiracy that at that time existed ” (vol. i., p. 210).

It is to be remembered that several utterly unoffending persons, among whom was the Chief Justice for Ireland, had been murdered without provocation in the rising ; and that, although Emmett would doubtless have prevented that murder if he had been able to do so, it was the direct result of his conspiracy. Much as we must sympathize with a high-minded young enthusiast, so suddenly, so early, and so tragically cut off, it is impossible to say that his fate was unmerited.

At the end of the same year (1803) Plunket was made Solicitor-General for Ireland, under Mr. Addington's administration, and succeeded as Attorney-General under Mr. Pitt in 1805. This office he retained under “ all the talents.” His office was distinctly understood not to be political, and hence he justly felt himself at liberty to act under Ministers of different politics. In 1807, however, he was persuaded, against his wish, to enter the Imperial Parliament ; and on April 9th delivered there a speech in support of the Catholic claims, of which Whitbread said a year later that “ it would never be forgotten.” When Ministers resigned on this question, immediately afterwards, Plunket refused to retain office, as he had

taken a political part with them. He returned to the private exercise of his profession, and did not again sit in Parliament until 1812. From this time his political life may be said to have recommenced, and its chief object was the removal of the yoke imposed upon the Catholics by unjust laws. As a British politician he belonged to the Grenville party.

Mr. Cashel Hoey says, in his remarks on Plunket's great speech in 1813 :—

A generation of Irish Catholics has grown to manhood since emancipation, and lost the memory of the old bondage. Many readers therefore may find it difficult to understand the exact bearing of this masterly argument, in which Plunket pleaded the rights of our fathers. I may therefore state in a few sentences the condition of the then existing penal laws. In many particulars the laws against Catholics differed in the three kingdoms. In Scotland they were most severe, even touching freedom of worship. In Ireland they had been relaxed so as to recognize full freedom of worship, the right to practise professions, to act under the royal commission in peace and war, to serve on juries, and to exercise the Parliamentary franchise. But the Acts of real grievance affecting the general body of the Catholics throughout the three kingdoms, and especially in England, were (1) the 13th Charles II. commonly called the Corporation Act, by which they were excluded from offices in cities and corporations ; (2) the 25th Charles II. commonly called the Test Act, by which they were excluded from all civil and military offices—except in the cases with regard to which the test was abolished by the Irish Act of 1793 ; (3) the 30th Charles II. by which Catholics were excluded from both Houses of Parliament. An Act of William and Mary, in force in England, deprived them of the Parliamentary franchise. The Mutiny and Admiralty Acts enabled officers to compel Catholic soldiers and sailors to attend Protestant worship. There were many other statutes, especially in England and Scotland, unrepealed, but practically inoperative. The machinery of exclusion was, either the oath of supremacy, declaring the king's civil and ecclesiastical pre-eminence within the realm, or the Sacramental Test of taking the Protestant Communion before taking office, or a declaration denying transubstantiation, and denouncing as idolatrous the invocation of saints and the sacrifice of the mass. By Members of Parliament both the oath and the declaration were taken. Whenever Catholics were admitted to office, they disclaimed upon oath the temporal authority of the Pope outside his own States, and the doctrine that the infallibility of His Holiness was an article of faith (vol. i., p. 113).

Mr. Plunket gives us the best reproduction that is now attainable of several of those great speeches on behalf of the Catholics, by which his grandfather astonished the British Senate at a time when the voices of Pitt and Fox had hardly ceased to echo through it. We have those delivered in April, 1807. Then (after five years' retirement from political life) that of February, 1813 (vol. i., p. 309); that of February, 1821 (vol. ii.,



p. 20), the report of which was corrected by the speaker, contrary to his usual practice ; that of February 28, 1825, when the Relief Bill was introduced by Sir Francis Burdett and passed the Commons by a majority of twenty-one ; and his speeches on the same subject in the House of Lords. Of his first speech in that House, in 1827, the editor says :—

It had been looked forward to with much interest, as well because of the great authority which attached to his name in connection with the question of Catholic Emancipation as on account of his reputation as an orator. Those who still remember his brilliant effort on this occasion have assured me that never before, either in the Irish or English Houses of Commons, did he more completely captivate the admiration and compel the respect of his audience. It is deeply to be regretted that while none of his speeches in the House of Lords have been preserved in a corrected form, the report of this, his first and perhaps most brilliant effort, is the most meagre of all. I select, however, a few sentences which I think interesting.

Of his speech when this subject came before Parliament for the last time, in 1829, he says :—

Though not corrected by Lord Plunket himself, it was evidently very carefully taken down at the time, and is much the best of all the reports we have of his orations in the House of Lords.

There are some speeches on this great question which the editor has omitted—not, unquestionably, as less worthy of report in themselves, but because he thinks with Lord Brougham that “the present collection gives all his speeches in Parliament which he either revised, or which there are the means of finishing now.” Yet Lord Brougham is said to have pronounced one of the speeches omitted in these volumes, that on the Relief Bill, in 1827, to have been the greatest Plunket ever delivered. So fugitive a possession, after all, is oratorical talent. Even in our own days, when reporting has been made as perfect as photography, the best-reported speech, like the best photograph, always leaves something to be desired. But in Plunket's times the reports were, with few exceptions, something more like the caricatures of that day, when a new art had not yet been created by H. B.

We shall not attempt the hopeless task of giving within our limits extracts worthy of the powers of this great orator. What is chiefly to be insisted on is the peculiar character of his speeches. As a boy in the Historical Society he was ambitious of ornament. His earlier speeches at the Irish Bar retain something of the same character. But long before he entered the British or even the Irish Parliament, he had learned to make oratory his servant, not his master. Those who yet

retain the old prejudice that Irish oratory consists in words rather than in argument, will soon be disabused if they read one of Plunket's great speeches ; if, indeed, any man who, in spite of the name of Burke, still retains that prejudice is capable of being disabused. Lord Brougham most truly says :—

Though the great characteristic of his eloquence was the clearness of his argument and the sacrifice of everything to the advancement of his cause, yet even his figurative passages were the object of unmixed admiration, even as results of the imagination, and independently of their invariable introduction to help the argument, or indeed as portions of it. His description of the limitation of actions by time is perhaps the most celebrated instance. It is the use of an image familiar to all men's minds of Time as an old man with a scythe in his hand, which the orator says he uses to mow down the muniments of title ; but the lawgiver places an hour-glass in his other hand, to mete out those periods of possession which supply the security which the muniments he has destroyed can no longer give. This famous passage was in a speech early in life before the Court of Chancery. But to show the utter groundlessness of the rumour circulated, that his powers had become enfeebled by age, I well recollect a speech in the House of Lords, as late as the Reform Bill of 1830, when he explained how he, once an adversary, had become a friend to Reform ; and this speech had all the transcendent merits of his best days, giving an image at once most picturesque and most strictly applicable to the whole subject, which it not only illustrated, but demonstrated. “ In those days Reform approached us in a far different guise ; it came as a felon and we resisted. It comes now as a creditor. We admit the debt, and only dispute on the instalments by which it shall be paid.”

So perfectly sustained and uninterrupted was the reasoning of his speeches that each sentence, and oftentimes each member of a sentence, was a complete argument.

Again : he says—

He was eminently an argumentative speaker, his reasonings on all cases, from the most important to that of daily occurrence, being addressed throughout to the understanding of the hearers, with rare appeals to their feelings, and what at first glance appeared like figure, sentiment, or declamation was found, when carefully considered, to be an essential portion of the reasoning. This was even more true of Plunket than of Erskine, and it was the characteristic of his eloquence in Parliament. There never was a more argumentative speaker, or one, *experto crede*, more difficult to grapple with and answer ; and the extraordinary impression produced by him was caused by the whole texture of his speeches being argumentative ; the diction plain but forcible, the turn often epigrammatic ; the figures as natural as they were unexpected ; so that what had occurred to no one seemed as if every one ought to have thought of it. But all—strong expressions, terse epigram, happy figure—were wholly subservient to the purpose in view, and were manifestly perceived never to be themselves the object—never introduced for their own

sake. They were the sparks thrown off by the motion of the engine, not fireworks to amuse by their singularity and please by their beauty ; all was for use, not ornament ; all for work, nothing for display ; the object ever in view, the speaker never, either of himself or of the audience. Lord Plunket probably surpassed all [orators] in this, that there was no interval whatever in his speech, the whole being an exemplification of the rule: clear statement, close reasoning, felicitous illustration—all strictly confined to the subject in hand—every portion, without any exception, furthering the process of conviction (vol. i., pp. 7, 9).

Who would have supposed that this was the estimate made by a Scotchman of an Irishman ?

The passing of the Act of Catholic emancipation in 1829 might seem the natural close of Plunket's political career. But in the debates on the Reform Bill of 1831 he was, as Brougham bears witness, fully equal to his former self. He spoke afterwards in the debates on the Irish Tithes and on "National Education."

On January 30th, 1830, he was appointed Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and held the office (with only three months' interval, from January to April, 1835, when Sir Edward Sugden held it under Peel's short administration) until June, 1841. His resignation of it, the last event of his public life, was under circumstances deeply disgraceful to the Whig party, with whom he was acting, and specially to Lord Campbell. In the summer of that year it became evident to all men that the reign of the Whigs was over. Peel had waited long "until the pear was ripe," and it was dropping into his hands. On June 23rd Lord Melbourne dissolved Parliament, the only alternative being immediate resignation. But all men foresaw, what actually happened, that the first vote of the new Parliament would put an end to his term of office. Sir John Campbell had been Attorney-General since 1835 ; and wished, it was commonly believed, to have a right to a pension. This he would have as an ex-Chancellor, but not as ex-Attorney-General. Under these circumstances the Whigs actually determined to push off the woolsack in Ireland the most illustrious Irishman of the day, that the Scotch Attorney-General might be Chancellor of Ireland for a few weeks. If any one cares to read the letters of Lord Melbourne and Lord Ebrington on this job, they are (very properly) published in the volumes before us. They are, we must say, piteous. Given the job, and there is nothing to complain of in the letters. It is painful to see men with the feelings of gentlemen forced to do such dirty work for others quite incapable of understanding such feelings. Lord Campbell seems to have begun some eighteen months before : for we all know, there are

animals in whom the knowledge that a house is about to fall is instinctive. Lord Melbourne wrote to the Lord-Lieutenant in October, 1839:—"We hear from various quarters that Lord Plunket would not be unwilling to retire, but nothing from himself or which can be implicitly relied on. I should be very unwilling to propose to him anything which could hurt his feelings or be inconsistent with his wishes. But it would be convenient to us if we could now get the Irish seals for the Attorney-General. Do you know anything of Lord Plunket's wishes, or do you know any means of sounding him without giving him uneasiness?" A copy of this was sent him by Lord Ebrington, and he at once offered to resign; but so strongly marked his own feelings on the subject that Lord Melbourne withdrew the proposal with expressions of regret that it had been made. In June, 1841, Sir John Campbell evidently felt that it was too late to wait any longer. Poor Lord Melbourne writes again, this time direct to Lord Plunket, to ask whether he was "willing" to resign, because "it would be most convenient, and we are most anxious to provide for the Attorney-General, which the present state of the courts of law does not enable us to do in this country." He ends, "if it is repugnant to your feelings, say so at once, and there is an end of the matter." Lord Plunket replies, "As you candidly tell me to say at once whether such an arrangement would be repugnant to my feelings, I think it the most straightforward course to say that it would be so." Unluckily "there was" not "an end of the matter." There are several more letters well worth reading. The "end of the matter" was that Lord Ebrington, to whom Plunket felt himself "under obligations," was made to request his resignation "as a personal favour to himself;" and then the job went on swimmingly. When the seals were safe, and not before, Lord Campbell writes, "How exceedingly distressed I am to learn that you have expressed dissatisfaction with the circumstances attending your resignation of the Great Seal of Ireland. I can solemnly declare that, when it was proposed to me to be your successor" [it is plain the simple man would never have thought of such a thing, if other people had not thought of it for him] "I believed you were desirous to be relieved from the fatigues of office, and that no opposition would be offered to my appointment. What has happened cannot be recalled, and nothing remains except that I should repair to the scene of my new duties, and perform them to the best of my ability." His unwillingness and self-sacrifice are obvious. This letter was written three days after the dissolution of Parliament, June 26th. In August was to come the anticipated

change of administration, and Sir Edward Sugden again to be Chancellor of Ireland. There was evidently not a day to be lost. Lord Campbell writes to his predecessor, "I think it respectful and proper to announce to you that, according to the wishes of the Lord-Lieutenant, I intend to be in Dublin on Monday next." Still, he is all sweet submission to the "wishes" of others. The day appointed was very rough, and a friend suggested to Plunket that the new Lord Chancellor would be very sea-sick. "Yes," replied Plunket, who knew his man, "but it won't make him throw up the seals." Lord Campbell had to wait eighteen years for the Great Seal of England; he took it when much older than Plunket was when he thought he must be so anxious to be relieved from that of Ireland, and died holding it in a firm grasp.

Plunket, says Lord Brougham, never again alluded, either in public or private, to the "vile intrigue" by which he was removed from office. Personally to him it was nothing, for he could not and would not have retained it under the change of Ministers only two months later; but, besides the injury to the country, when the names of eminent men in high station are soiled by dirty acts, it was a public loss to show that Ireland was still regarded by the Whig Ministers as a scene where they could with impunity practise any dirty job for the benefit of a hungry Scotchman who could not well be "provided for" at home. Nothing more strongly proves the rapid steps by which Ireland is taking her just place in the Empire than the utter impossibility which we all feel of such a job being attempted, even, we will venture to say, by Lord Russell himself in 1867, as that which was actually perpetrated by such men as Lord Melbourne and Lord Ebrington as lately as 1841. Of the remaining years of Plunket's life we know, as we have already said, hardly anything.

On the last occasion of his appearing in the Court of Chancery, in which for more than forty years he had pleaded, and for ten years had sat as judge, every portion of its space was crowded by barristers of all ranks and creeds, who came to give him a farewell, full of affection and respect, and worthy of him and of them.

After a touching parting he retired, "leaning upon the arm of Sir Michael O'Loughlen, Master of the Rolls." His statue stands in the Hall of the four courts, with the inscription, "Erected by the Bar of Ireland."

Of the thirteen last years of his life we are told only—

After he left the Bench, Lord Plunket withdrew himself wholly from politics. He at first spent some time on the Continent, lingering long at Rome, in whose venerable monuments his well-remembered classical lore

caused him to take a deep interest ; and, when he returned to Ireland, he settled at once at Old Connaught, where he passed the rest of his life surrounded by his many children and grandchildren. For several years after his retirement his mind retained its perfect vigour, and, with a few friends, who were old enough to remember the stirring events of his earlier career, he was fond of recurring to those times. It particularly pleased him, too, to cap quotations from the great Greek and Latin authors with those who were fresh from school and college studies—a competition in which he was always successful. Gradually, however, the weight of nearly ninety years began to press heavily upon him, and the complete change from habits of busy life to those of total idleness told upon his mind, so that his last days were spent in a sad intellectual lethargy, and death came to him with a merciful release.

Lord Plunket died on the 4th day of January, 1854, in his ninetieth year, and was buried in Mount Jerome cemetery, near Dublin (vol. ii., p. 346).

Justice compels us to add that the unfavourable impression with regard to his character which lurks in the minds of many who have never given it any special attention is utterly unjust. It arose, we suspect, chiefly from the invectives of Cobbett, one of the best haters as well as most forcible writers of his day. He began to assail Plunket in 1803, after he had appeared as counsel against Emmett ; in a libel for which Plunket obtained £500 damages. Of all men, he was the last to forget such a blow, and to the last day of his life it was his delight to make insulting contrasts between the speech in which Plunket had pledged himself in 1800 to bring up his children sworn, like young Hannibal, to animosity against the Union, and the care which he afterwards took to provide for the “young Hannibals” in public stations. The only rational foundation for these charges is, that he certainly intended in 1800 to strive for the immediate repeal of the Union ; and, on calm consideration, gave up the idea. Grattan did the same. Having once come to this conclusion, there was nothing inconsistent or unpatriotic in his accepting office himself as he did in 1803, nor any reason why his family should not also discharge offices of whose duties they were capable. It was no disgrace to Plunket that he had six sons and five daughters ; nor that, having the opportunity, he provided for them as well as he could. One was a Protestant bishop, another Chairman of a county, a third Commissioner of Bankrupts, a fourth Vicar of Bray. If it be objected that they were placed in situations for which they were not qualified, the very first step towards weighing that objection would be to settle what may really be the final cause and qualifications of a Protestant bishop placed by the Government of his country in a diocese in which there are no Protestants except the Protestant clergy, and amid the poorest population in the



world, and laden with endowments given for the religious benefit of that population. If any man can discover what the final cause of such an official is, and what qualifications are necessary to attain it, we do not despair of proving that they were possessed in abundance by the second Lord Plunket. We have never heard any complaint as to the character of his two sons in the legal profession, of which he was better qualified to judge. The real question is whether he showed any unbecoming desire for office, and especially whether he sacrificed his principles or consistency to that desire. Upon this point Lord Brougham says:—"Plunket's public life, which only the unreflecting clamours of faction have charged with inconsistency, was peculiarly marked by uniform devotion to the principles which he had deliberately adopted and steadily maintained." This sentence is strictly just, and deserves more confidence because the cases in which it might most plausibly be maintained that his conduct was inconsistent were those in which he most strenuously opposed Lord Brougham, and those with whom he acted. These were, first the passing of the "Six Acts," by which the liberty of public meeting, the freedom of the press, and the right of possessing arms were for a time very seriously limited. In the discussion of these Acts Brougham and Plunket came more than once into direct collision. Looking back upon them "four or five years ago," Lord Brougham seems to have formed a correct judgment. He still thought Plunket "plainly in the wrong; but that it should be remembered he erred with some of our greatest statesmen, Lord Wellesley and Lord Grenville;" and, he adds, "it is certain that, after the heats of party warfare had cooled, most of us admitted that some restraint upon the right of public meetings had become necessary for the preservation of this valuable privilege to the people." On another question, when he approved the renewal of the war against Napoleon, after his return from Elba in 1815, Lord Brougham now sees that Plunket was right, although at the time of a contrary opinion. But what can hardly be doubted is, that whether mistaken upon them or not, the disciple of Burke could not fail to see these questions as he did, and that the suspicion of inconsistency or unworthy motives would more reasonably have attached to him had he acted otherwise.

Of all men, Plunket should have been one of the last to suffer under the charge of sacrificing his principles to office, for it was belied by his deliberate acts. He resigned the office of Attorney-General for Ireland in 1807, when the English ministers went out on the Catholic question. He



might, if he would, have retained not merely that office, but the preponderating influence in the Irish Government, as Saurin, a man not to be compared to him, did for fifteen years. All this he voluntarily abandoned; although he himself held, and had always avowed, the opinion, that the office was not and ought not to be made political; and although both his colleagues in the outgoing administration and the leaders in that which was coming in, including Lord Hawkesbury and Sir Arthur Wellesley, the incoming Secretary for Ireland, united in urging him to retain it. He replied in an excellent letter, in which he repeats the expression of his conviction that he was not bound to resign, and his resolution to do so "as sacrificing my office not to principle, but to character." It was to this that Grattan referred, when he said that Plunket had shown "a contempt for salary equal to his regard for law." A man who has acted thus, has a strict right to appeal to his character as a ground of confidence, if his conduct and motives in taking or retaining office are ever matters of question. Nothing gives so much security as actions. It is also to be remembered that when Canning took office in March, 1827, Plunket had a right to the great seal of Ireland by all ordinary rules, and was kept out of it for four years more, solely on account of his earnestness on behalf of Catholic emancipation. As soon as the Act of 1829 was passed, the office fell to him as a matter of course.

This book fully confirms what has so often been shown, that the Union was carried by the assistance of the Catholics, and by a virtual, although not a formal engagement on the part of Pitt and the Ministers by whom it was urged, that it should immediately be followed by a bill admitting Catholics to equal rights with Protestants. Nay, Mr. Plunket quotes from "Castlereagh's Correspondence" an important sentence of a letter from Mr. Elliot, dated November, 1798, which, as he says, seems to prove that Pitt's original intention was to incorporate "Catholic emancipation as a portion of the Act of Union." The words are, "I cannot easily be persuaded that if more firmness had been displayed here at first, a Union might not have been accomplished including the admission of the Catholic claims; but Mr. Pitt has, with a lamentable facility, yielded this point to prejudice, without, I suspect, acquiring a support in any degree equivalent to the sacrifice."

Be this as it may, Mr. Plunket is abundantly borne out in saying—

No one who reads the political correspondence that passed on the subject of the Union, and has since been published, can doubt that there was a time

when the success of that measure seemed to hang upon the part taken with regard to it by the leaders of the Catholics. It is also certain that the Irish opposition were prepared to go great lengths to secure the assistance of that body ; on the other hand, the friends of Government, by effectually encouraging their hopes, produced a favourable impression in some parts of the country. This, no doubt, seemed to imply a promise that if at the critical moment the Catholics assisted the Government to carry the Union, the latter would not be found wanting to their friends when their claims should become a question of Imperial policy. Lord Cornwallis evidently felt the responsibility which such conduct must impose upon him. He had been forbidden to pledge the Government directly to support emancipation, and yet he found that unless he "flattered the hopes of the Roman Catholics the great measure of the Union might miscarry."

Mr. Plunket does not hesitate to speak of the "indirect bargain struck by the Roman Catholic prelates with the English Government," and the common sense of posterity will confirm his judgment. We do not say this as any imputation upon Pitt. He allowed no expectation to be raised which he did not sincerely and honourably intend to fulfil. The difficulty in which he subsequently found himself was, that he must either disappoint the hopes he had allowed to be raised, or urge the king in a manner which experience had already shown would probably make him a confirmed lunatic, or else abandon, altogether and permanently, the service of his country at the very moment when her danger was greater than at any former period of her history. Perhaps a high-minded statesman never before found himself face to face with alternatives so heartrending. Mr. Wilberforce (one of the most intimate as well as earliest of his friends) has left on record his conviction that Pitt died of "a broken heart." We are convinced that the question in which Ireland was on one side and the king on the other, contributed to that end, as well as the battle of Austerlitz, on the news of which he bade his friends roll up the map of Europe as a thing gone by.

It is impossible not to feel how strange and how much beyond calculation was the misfortune which brought matters to this pass. Upon a question no less momentous than the civil rights and good government of the Irish nation—a question upon which the existence of the British empire seemed more than once to depend, and by the consequences of which it is even at this moment threatened,—the ordinary working of the British constitution was suspended for many years together, and that not by the vices, but it must be said by the virtues, of George III. Had his conscience only been as accommodating as that of his son, or had his head been susceptible of an argument, the strange scruple which by

some unlucky chance had got stuck in it would at once have been removed, either by argument or necessity, and the unjust laws against the Catholics would have been repealed as soon as the Union was carried. Thirty years of misery and struggle would then have been spared to Ireland; thirty years of injustice to England. Above all, justice would not have been obtained by intimidation, after having been long refused to petitions urged by unequalled reasoning and eloquence. There is but one thing to set against this. Pitt, no doubt, would have wished to make the Catholic clergy pensioners of the State, and to have secured for the civil Government the veto upon the appointment of bishops. Who can say that Ireland might not have lost in religion as much as she gained in prosperity? Even if the clergy had retained their independence of mind, which we doubt not they would; and if the veto had never been used to deprive her of worthy prelates, which we do very greatly doubt; would not the confidence of the people in one and the other have been shaken? *Dis aliter visum*. Many years followed, in which the Ministers were divided among themselves; debates in which the ablest members of the Cabinet were in vain urging the claims of justice upon their own colleagues, nay, upon their own subordinates, and solemnly warning them of dangers which, however deeply and justly they felt them, they were, as a Cabinet, bound by a distinct promise to the king never even to represent to him. At last things became so fixed, that neither the long incapacity of the king, nor even his death, enabled any Minister to do what, but for the king's obstinate and senseless scruples, Pitt would have done without difficulty; and all the eloquence of Grattan and Plunket was only bringing the matter more and more into the almost hopeless condition of a party question between the Whigs and the Tories; from which it was in fact rescued, not by argument or eloquence, but by the agitation of O'Connell, the Catholic Association, the Clare election, and the imminent danger of civil war.

It is worth mentioning at the present moment that the symptom which is now the most unpleasant in Ireland, had already begun to show itself in 1828. Money had begun to come in from abroad. "Subscriptions in aid of the Catholic cause," says Mr. Plunket, "were gathered in France, Belgium, Spain, and Italy, and were sent to the Catholic Association in Dublin. In America the feeling of sympathy was, of course, stronger. From all the great cities of the United States addresses were forwarded, together with liberal subsidies." What would have been the state of things, years before this, if the penal laws existing in 1828 had not been relaxed?

Meanwhile, while Plunket and Grattan were meeting the more refined opponents of the Catholics in Westminster Hall, the lower members of the anti-Catholic faction were carrying on the government of Ireland itself in a manner which already seems hardly credible. Saurin, to whom Plunket in 1807 ceded the legal guidance of matters, together with the office of Attorney-General, was descended from a Huguenot emigrant. In many of these families enthusiasm had cooled down into mere negation. But his anti-Catholic heat had been kept up by friction against Catholics, and by the sympathy of Orangemen. After Plunket had succeeded him in 1821, a letter written by Saurin, while Attorney-General, to Lord Norbury, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, came to light in a strange manner. We give Mr. Sheil's account:—

Lord Norbury has always been remarkable for his frugality. He was in the habit of stuffing papers into the old chairs in his study, in order to supply the deficiency of horsehair which the incumbency of eighty years had produced in their bottoms. At last, however, they became, even with the aid of this occasional supplement, unfit for use, and were sent by his Lordship to an old furniture shop. A man named Monaghan got one of these chairs, and finding it stuffed with papers, drew them out. He had been clerk in an attorney's office, and knew Mr. Saurin's handwriting. He found the following letter addressed to a Chief Justice and going Judge of Assize by the principal law officer of the Crown.

The letter urged the Chief Justice to impress upon the "gentlemen of the country that, however they may think otherwise, the Catholics would, in spite of them, elect Catholic members (if such were eligible); that the Catholic members would then have the nominations of the sheriffs, and in many instances, perhaps, of the judges; and that the Protestants would be put in the background, as the Catholics were formerly. They could hardly consent to live in the country if it were passed.

"If you will judiciously administer a little of this medicine to the King's County or any other members of Parliament that may fall in your way, you will deserve well."

How justice was administered appears from a case mentioned only incidentally because Plunket was "in it."

A justice of the peace for the county of Antrim, who was also a colonel of yeomanry, added to many other vices a libertinism which he indulged heartlessly among the wives and daughters of his poorer tenantry. One of his victims, a young girl of eighteen, finding herself in a condition in which she had a claim at least for the protection of her seducer, applied to him for assistance. He not only refused this, but on some frivolous pretext of complicity with the rebels, handed her over to his troopers to be scourged. His brutal order was too faithfully carried out. The poor woman died almost imme-

diately after the infliction of the torture, having given birth to a still-born child. A highly coloured account of this transaction was published by a gentleman, residing in another part of the same county, and an action for libel against the latter was the consequence. Plunket was brought over from the North West to the North East circuit by the plaintiff, and Bushe was specially retained for the defendant.

The action for libel failed. What is remarkable is that no other proceedings seem to have been adopted. Probably it would have been as impossible to have obtained a true bill in such a case in Antrim in those days, as it would now in Jamaica.

It was this state of feeling that made Plunket declare in the House of Lords:—

Persons who have not resided in the country can form no idea of the state of things that exists in it. They cannot understand the way in which the subsisting odious divisions operate. My Lords, it is not a hostility of one part of the kingdom against another that is occasioned by them,—it is not a hostility between sect and sect,—but a hostility of individual to individual,—a hostility that finds its way into the bosom of families,—that pervades all the relations of life, and vitiates the whole system of society (ii., p. 279).

No wonder these things culminated in the state of society which Lord Cornwallis and Lord Wellesley describe; when, as Sheil says, “the cabinet seemed to be little better than a box in an amphitheatre, from whence his Majesty’s Ministers may survey the business of blood.” Plunket pointed the lesson when he said to the assembled Peers: “Do your Lordships object to this state of things? The demagogues are the spawn of your own wrong. You yourselves have created them, and instead of looking on persons thus engaged as objects of justice, you should rather consider them as victims to injuries of long standing.”

If we are asked what is now the use of dwelling upon crimes and miseries so long gone by, we answer that to us the consideration is encouraging. These things mark the progress which Ireland has already made towards a happy and prosperous state of society. They encourage us to hope that just government, which has already done so much, may, if consistently carried out, remove what yet remains of discontent and faction. If the evil is not yet wholly cured, we must remember that its causes are not yet wholly removed.

Mr. Plunket very truly says that these events and especially their justly founded feeling that faith had been substantially broken with them (however the circumstances may be explained), must be kept in view by those who would judge fairly of the subsequent conduct of Irish Catholics. To the com-

plaint that the Irish showed no "gratitude" for emancipation, Dr. Whately replied that he had always thought them rather too grateful to O'Connell; and as "for their being grateful to the British Government, you might as well talk of being grateful to an ox for a beefsteak."

All men are now agreed that Catholics could not justly be denied the common political rights of Englishmen, and, moreover, that, just or not, it would be simply impossible. This of course lessens the interest of Plunket's arguments. Were any one to repeat either before Lords or Commons the speeches he made among them some forty years ago, he would be told that every man was of the same mind. And yet it is impossible not to see that the whole tone and temper of his mind differs fundamentally from that of many with whom the measure he chiefly urged has become a matter of course. Such is the course of political discussions. The first men who urge measures founded on justice and right are considered paradoxical. In a few years their measures are declared to be so obvious as to deserve little praise, by the very men who would have been most obstinate in opposing them. Mr. Eyre and his English supporters condemn the slave trade, and even slavery. Lord Plunket laid down in 1821 the importance of not having different oaths for Catholics and Protestants, a principle which only the other day was opposed by a strong party, who in his day would have been for excluding Catholics from all political privileges.

There are few subjects upon which this biography excites a curiosity which it does not satisfy, so much as on Plunket's own views and opinions on religious matters. Probably this was one of those which his grandson had specially in his mind when he said that in giving an account of his private character, he "felt some delicacy from his nearness of kinship." The impression produced in reading his speeches is one of surprise that so able and active-minded a man, who had lived all his long life in Ireland in the closest political sympathy and co-operation with the whole Catholic body, and in habits of close personal intimacy with many individuals, should know so very little as he evidently did of the Catholic religion. It is not merely that he mistakes the meaning of common Catholic terms, as for instance when in proposing a Bill to give Catholic priests a right to bury in the ancient churchyards, he says they usually perform the service in a stole—"that is, a sort of black robe." He evidently did not at all understand either Catholic doctrines or Catholic worship. Probably the same was the case with Grattan and other Irishmen, who fought the battle of emancipation in the British Parliament,



as it certainly was, with their English coadjutors. They seem to have known the Catholic religion only on the outside ; to have viewed it as men do subjects which they know only from books. In all probability they did know it only thus. Some of their Catholic friends were probably men who, without being as contemptibly servile in private intercourse with Protestants as seems unfortunately to have been the case with the highly gifted author of the "Letters of an Irish Gentleman," had religious subjects very little at heart. They had no doubt a firm and undoubting faith, but troubled themselves little on the matter. Others, even of those who were personally religious, thought it wise to affect a liberalism of talk before Protestants, as if they really believed that there was no great difference between Catholic and Protestant ; although their real conviction was the contrary. Wonderful examples of this have come within our own knowledge. Even where none of these things exist, it is the instinct of Catholics, all the more in proportion to the depth of their religious convictions and feelings, to avoid all reference to the subject in conversing with those in whom they expect no sympathy. Be the reason what it may, Plunket seems to have had no more real notion of the religious habits and feelings of Catholics than of those of Mahomedans.

Lord Brougham most positively states that he was not in any degree indifferent or uninterested in religious matters. He says : " His earliest act, of leaving the Dissenting community of which his father had been a respected pastor, was the result of much patient and enlightened reflection ; for no one had stronger religious feelings, and no one was more thoroughly conversant in the opposite doctrines and observances of the two Churches. Erskine made the same change." By " the two Churches," Lord Brougham does not mean the Catholic and the Protestant, but the Church of England and Presbyterianism. We heartily wish that he had given us some proof or illustration of this statement. If his change really was the result of " much patient and enlightened reflection," that was one of the most remarkable facts of Plunket's life. His father died when he was only fourteen ; his mother was sister to a clergyman of the Established Church, and, as far as appears, he was educated in Church of England schools. Magee, for instance, afterwards not only Archbishop, but the most powerful writer of his day against Unitarianism, was his schoolfellow. To all appearance he was not conscious of any religious change ; and Unitarian, or at least latitudinarian, tendencies were so common among the clergy of the Establishment in the eighteenth century, that it would not be surprising if even his



clerical uncle regarded Dr. Plunket's Socinianism without any lively dislike. If under these circumstances young Plunket really reflected much and patiently, at the latest before he subscribed the Articles of the Established Church, when elected to a scholarship at eighteen, there were few more remarkable facts in his life. His biographer does not refer to it.

It is perhaps not wonderful that in a life so much occupied as his he never gave "much patient reflection" to the doctrines of the Catholic Church. That he did not is plain enough. He evidently thought, nay he publicly declared in Parliament, that Catholics in our day had really nothing in common with "Papists of Queen Mary's time"; *i.e.*, with such men as Cardinal Pole, her Archbishop of Canterbury. He repeats in several places that Catholics used to take the Oath of Supremacy. In a very curious letter to Canning in 1826, the object of which was to try whether some way could not be found of letting in the Catholics without offending Protestant prejudices, he suggests whether it might not be managed by merely repealing "the declaration [against Transubstantiation], and so leaving matters as they stood at the Reformation, when the Oath of Supremacy was generally taken by Roman Catholics, as I think after some time it would still be: and letting the Sacramental test rest upon the annual Bill of indemnity." One would have liked to ask him what he thought was the distinguishing peculiarity of the Catholic religion. His *alter ego*, Archbishop Magee, stated in a published charge, that the Irish Establishment stood "between a Church without a religion [the Catholic], and a religion without a Church [the Presbyterian]." We much doubt whether he could have given a more intelligible account.

He told the House of Commons in 1821 that the doctrine of the Catholic Church about the Eucharist, "I can neither affirm nor deny, because I can't understand it any more than if it was laid down as a dogma that it was of a blue colour or six feet high. I feel satisfied, as a sincere Christian resting on Scripture and reason, that it is not necessary for me to involve myself in these mysteries; and of this I am very sure, that I should act a very un-Christian, as well as a very ungentlemanly part, if I were to join in giving foul names to the professors of this, to me, incomprehensible dogma."

He objected to the declaration that the Mass is "superstitious and idolatrous" very forcibly, no doubt, by asking—

I entreat each member of this House to suppose I am asking him as a private gentleman, does he know what is said, or meant, or done in the sacri-

fice of the Mass, or how it differs from our own mode of celebrating the communion so as to render it superstitious and idolatrous ?

We strongly suspect he knew little more himself.

It is no great wonder that he imagined the Catholics in general were not against the Established Church. That they were not so he pledges himself over and over again. He repudiates the idea in the strongest terms. He declares, and we cannot doubt, sincerely, that if he believed that emancipation would in any way weaken the Establishment he would oppose it. He was confident that it would "rivet the honest Roman Catholic to the State by every good affection of his nature ;" and these words, "to the State," he explains—"I say to the State, because I trust that every man who hears me will say that to subvert the Protestant Establishment is to subvert the State."

We have marked many more passages to the same effect, if more had been needed. In the same speech he declares, "on behalf of the Roman Catholics, that any well-informed Roman Catholic knows that the Protestant religion of England and Ireland" "forms a part of the fundamental, unalterable law of the empire ;" that he therefore prefers a Protestant Establishment and an unimpaired State, to a Roman Catholic Establishment and a subverted one ; that he considers the possessions of the Protestant clergy as their absolute property, &c.

There are those who complain of a change in the tone of the Catholics on this and other similar subjects. They should remember that those who advocated the cause of Catholics in those days were not Catholics, and could only imperfectly reflect their feelings and opinions. How would a Liberal member of Parliament in the present day succeed in explaining to the House of Commons the views and feelings, say, of a Ritualist ? Next there can be no greater mistake than to attribute the present danger of the Irish Establishment to emancipation. It is plain that if, *per impossibile*, emancipation had never taken place, the animosity of Irish Catholics against it would have been a thousand times greater than it is or ever has been. So far we are sure that all Plunket's anticipations have been fulfilled.

We could say much more on this subject, but our space warns us to conclude. We heartily thank Mr. Plunket for a very useful and interesting book, his own part of which does the highest credit both to his literary powers, his taste, and his political principles, and we trust that this will not be the last occasion on which he will give us the benefit of them.

## ART. IV.—THE GODS OF THE NATIONS WHEN CHRIST APPEARED.

*Heidenthum und Judenthum.* Vorhalle zur Geschichte des Christenthums.  
Von J. J. T. DOLLINGER. Regensburg. 1857.

UNDER the sceptre of the imperial unity were brought together a hundred different lands occupied by as many different races. That rule of Rome which had grown for many centuries without, as it seemed, any presiding thought, by the casual accretions of conquest, may be said to assume under the hands of Augustus, about the year of Rome 750, certain definite and deliberately chosen limits, and to be governed by a fixed Idea, more and more developed in the imperial policy. The limits which the most fortunate of Roman emperors, nay the creator of the empire itself, put to it, were the Rhine and Danube, with the Euxine Sea, on the north; the deserts of Africa on the south; the Euphrates on the east; the ocean on the west. The Idea, which may indeed have been conceived by Julius, but was certainly first embodied by Augustus, was to change the constitution of a conquering city, ruled by an aristocratic senate, into a commonwealth governed by one man, the representative of the whole people; and the effect of this change, an effect no doubt unforeseen, at least in its extent, by its framer, was gradually to absorb the manifold races inhabiting these vast regions into the majesty of the Roman law, order, and citizenship. The three centuries which follow Augustus, are occupied in working out the drama of this unity. During this time, the provinces appear to come out more and more as parts of one whole. Some which at its commencement had only just entered the circle of Roman power and thought, as Gaul, become entirely interpenetrated with the law, language, customs, and civilization of the sovereign city. Spain was nearly as much, and northern Africa perhaps even more Latinized: in all, local inequalities, and the dissimilarity arising from conflicting races, customs, and languages, are more and more softened down, though never entirely removed; and while throughout this period the great city continues the head, yet the body assumes an ever increasing importance, until at length its members engage the equal solicitude of that central potentate to whom all equally belong. In the times of so-called Roman liberty, the plunder

of lands which received pro-consuls for their annual rulers, served to replenish the fortunes of nobles exhausted by the corruption requisite to gain high office; but if the dominion of one at Rome seemed an evil exchange to a nobility which deemed itself born to enjoy a conquered world, at least it served as a protection to those many millions for whom the equality of law and order, the fair administration of justice, and the undisturbed possession of property, constituted the chief goods of life. Cicero and his peers might grieve over the extinction of what they termed liberty, but Gaul, Spain, Africa, and Asia exulted in deliverance from the oppression of a Verres, a Fonteius, a Gabinius, a Piso, or a Clodius, in the communication of citizenship, and in the peace of a common civilization.

I. With a passing glance at the progress of this unity, which, great and magnificent as it is, is yet external, let us turn to an object filling the whole of this vast empire with its varied manifestations: for this object leads us to the consideration of another unity, wholly internal, without which that of government, law, and order must be apparent rather than real, or at best, however seemingly imposing, be deprived of the greater part of its efficacy.

1. It has been said that the empire contained in it many lands and many races, but these likewise worshipped their own distinct gods, which were acknowledged and sanctioned as national divinities for the several countries wherein they were locally established. Had Augustus ordered an enrolment not only of the numbers, the landed property, and the wealth of his subjects, but of their gods, his public register, or *Breviarium*, would have included at least ten distinct systems of idolatrous worship. First of all, there would be the proper gods of Rome, then those of the Hellenic race; and these, though the most similar to each other, yet refused a complete amalgamation. But besides these there were on the west the Etrurian, the Iberian, the Gallic, and the Germanic gods; on the east, the Carian and Phrygian, the Syrian, the Assyrian, the Arabian; on the south, the Phœnician, Libyan, and Egyptian. All these different races, inasmuch as they were subjects of the empire, enjoyed undisturbed the right of worshipping their ancestral gods,\* who, so long as they did not

---

\* Tertull. Apolog. xxiv. "Ideo et Ægyptiis permissa est tam vanæ superstitionis potestas, avibus et bestiis consecrandis, et capite damnandis qui aliquem hujusmodi Deum occiderint. Unicuique etiam provinciæ et civitati suus Deus est, ut Syriæ Astartes, ut Arabiæ Disares, ut Noricis Belenus, ut Africæ Cælestis, ut Mauritanie Reguli sui," &c.; and Minucius Felix, Octavius vi. in like manner.

overstep their local boundaries, were recognized; they possessed priests, rites, temples, estates, and self-government; they held the soil, and their worship was legal. It was a matter of Roman policy not to interfere with them. Nay, their several worshippers could carry their rites along with them in their various sojourns and settlements, and even in Rome itself build altars, and adore Egyptian, Asiatic, African, or Gallic gods. These various systems agreed all in one point, that they were systems of polytheistic idolatry: they all divided the attributes of the godhead, assigning them to more or fewer objects, and worshipping all these by visible symbols which the power worshipped was deemed to inhabit:\* but they did not make the same division with a mere difference of name; on the contrary, they ran into and across each other with the most bewildering multiplicity, variation, and contradiction. Even in the same system, if we may give this name to any of the various mythologies, the several divinities were perpetually interfering with each other's province. When the Roman made vows for the removal of his ailments, in his uncertainty to which god the ailment belonged, or who was most proper to remove it, he addressed his vow to several together; or in public supplications, being often uncertain to whom exactly the prayer or offering should be made, he cautiously expressed himself, "whether it be a god or a goddess." And the various Hellenic, Asiatic, or Egyptian cities often possessed local gods, whose worship was supreme there, while they exercised far less influence, or were even scarcely known elsewhere.†

Now merely as a specimen of what this worship was all over the Roman empire, let us take the brilliant Athens, Greece's eye, the world's university. First of all ruled in her the worship of Pallas-Athene: she was the lady of the land, who had won it for her own after a hard contest with Poseidon. Her chief sanctuaries were the temple of Athene, guardian of the city, with its old statue fallen down from heaven on the Acropolis. On the Acropolis, likewise the Parthenon, built expressly for the gorgeous Panathenaic festival; and in the lower city the Palladium with the statue of the goddess supposed to have been brought from Troy. Yet the worship of the "high goddesses," Demeter and Persephone, was also richly endowed with shrines and festivals, and affected scarcely less the feelings of the Athenians. Then Jupiter, as "supreme," was honoured with unbloody offering before the Erectheium,

---

\* See Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. viii. 24.

† Döllinger, Heidenthum und Judenthum, pp. 528, 529.

dedicated to Athene: whilst as "Olympian," he had the colossal temple begun by Peisistratus and finished after many hundred years by Hadrian, and as "guardian of the city" distinct festivals. Yet more manifold was the invocation of Apollo, as the Pythian, the Delphic, the Lycian, as the ancestral god of the Ionians. The multiform Artemis had her temples and worshippers as the Tauric, by the name Brauronia; as the port-goddess, by the name Munychia; as the goddess of the hunt, by the name Agrotera, who had the credit of the victory won at Marathon; as presiding over birth, she was called Chitone, while Themistocles had built a temple to her as the Counsellor. Heré had only a doorless and roofless temple on the road to Phalerum; but the god of fire was worshipped in Athens abundantly. Hermes had his peculiar statues in every street, irreverence to which might be fatal even to an Alcibiades, the city's darling; while Aphrodité had a crowd of temples and shrines whose unchaste worship found but too many frequenters. Poseidon had to content himself with a single altar in his rival's city, and with games in its harbour; but Dionysos had three temples, with brilliant festivals; Mars was not without one; Hestia was throned in the Prytaneum; the Earth, Kronos, and Rhea had their temples and festivals, as also the Erinnyes, who were worshipped only in two other places in Greece. Here alone in Greece was a sanctuary and a rite to Prometheus, while the Asiatic mother of the gods had a splendid temple where the archives of the state were kept. Besides, there was the worship of the hours and the graces, of Ilithyia, goddess of victory and of birth; of Æsculapius and Themis, of the Kabirian Anakes, the Arcadian Pan, the Thracian Cotytto and Bendis, the Egyptian Serapis. Mercy and Shame, Fame and Endeavour had their altars; and the hero-worship numbered Theseus, Codrus, Academus, Solon, the tyrant-slayers Harmodius and Aristogeiton; and Hercules, originally a hero, but here and elsewhere widely honoured as a god.\*

Athens, if the most superstitious as well as the most intellectual of cities, may be taken as the type of a thousand others of Hellenic race scattered over the Roman empire from Marseilles to Antioch. Say that she had twice as many deities and festivals as her sister cities, enough will remain for them wherewith to occupy the soil with their temples and to fill the year's cycle with their rites.

The lively Grecian imagination impregnated not with stern notions of duty, nor with reverential devotion to those whom

---

\* From Heidenthum und Judenthum, pp. 101-2.



it worshipped, but regarding them as objects of esthetical satisfaction,\* and yearning for a serene and confidential exchange of relations with them, had in process of time spun out a complete web of idolatrous worship which encompassed heaven and earth, the whole domain of nature, every state and act of human life.

Rain and sunshine and the weather stood under the ordering of Zeus ; the fruitfulness of the soil was Demeter's care ; countless nymphs of field, of fountain, and of river, offered to men their gifts ; the vine and its juice was under the protection of Dionysos, and Poseidon was lord of the sea. The flocks had their defenders in Hermes and Pan ; the Fates ruled the lot of men. Kings and magistrates had in Zeus their prototype and guardian. Athene held her shield over cities ; the hearth of each private home and the public hearth of the city were in Hestia's charge. Marriage was secure under Héré's care. Demeter was entrusted with legislation ; the pains of childbirth were recommended to Ilithyia, or Artemis. Music, archery, divination, were Apollo's attributes ; the art of healing claimed him and his son Asclepius as patrons. Athene and Ares swayed the issue of war ; the chase was the domain of Artemis ; smiths, and all workers in fire, saw in Hephæstus their patron, whilst Athene the Worker protected the gentler trades, and Hecate watched over the roads.†

Yet Rome itself, whose own Capitoline Jupiter claimed a certain superiority over all these gods, would scarcely have yielded to any Grecian city, even were it Athens, in the number or variety of her deities, the frequency and solemnity of her festivals ; while in the costliness of victims offered to her gods, and in the strictness of her ceremonies, she probably far surpassed that and all other cities. Her sterner worship of originally shapeless gods, presiding over the labours of a simple agricultural life, had long yielded to the seductions of her dangerous Grecian captive. The rude block Terminus, and Jupiter the Stone, ceased to satisfy those who had beheld the majesty of the father of gods and men embodied by the genius of a Phidias ; and she had ended by going farther in breaking up the conception of one god, and in the personification of particular powers, operations, physical functions, and qualities, than any nation of antiquity.‡ But though the beautiful forms of the Hellenic gods, as expressed by the skill of unrivalled sculptors, had carried her away, yet the nature of her worship was in strong contrast with that of Greece. Her religion had rested originally on two ideas, the might of the gods friendly to Rome, and the force of ceremonial over

---

\* Heidenthum und Judenthum, p. 480.

† Ibid. p. 107.

‡ Ibid. p. 469.



these gods;\* and still when she accepted the gods of conquered nations for her own, it was to secure the possession of their might, and to have them for friends instead of foes, while her own worship was a matter of routine and habit jealously guarded by unchanging ceremonies, and prosecuted not out of affection, but for the material security of daily life, which, according to the deeply rooted feeling of the people, could not go on without it.

The individualized and humanized Latin and Hellenic gods, if they had much in common, still could not be thoroughly amalgamated, but Rome, as the mistress of Western Asia and Egypt, came upon Oriental religions of a very different stamp. Instead of this wide Pantheon of gods, each of whom had his occupation, these Asiatics generally regarded the deity in a sexual relationship, as one male and one female god, representing the active and passive forms of nature,† and worshipped with a mixture of fear and voluptuousness. Such were Bel and Mylitta, Moloch and Astarte, and by whatever different names the same idea was presented. The worship of the great mother Cybele, so widely spread through Asia Minor, approached in many respects in character to that of this female goddess. But it is needless to go farther into the specific differences of these various idolatries; only bear in mind that they in their several countries occupied the domain of public and private life, as the worship of which I have given the details did at Athens. So it was before the influence of external conquerors reached them. After this a certain change ensues. The Roman empire was accomplishing in the west as well as in the east what the progress of Grecian rule and thought had commenced three hundred years before‡ under Alexander and his successors, the bringing together and in some sort fusing the multiform and often contradictory worship of the nations surrounding the Mediterranean Sea. Not merely in Rome, but in all the chief cities of the Empire, the Asiatic, the Egyptian, the Libyan deities, and many others of subject nations under the Roman sway, were worshipped side by side. Accordingly, in the time of Augustus, and at the year of Rome 750, where we are taking our stand, there prevailed all over the hundred millions of men ruled by him, a polytheistic idolatry bewildering by its multiplicity, internal contradictions, fluctuations, and mixtures, yet imposing by its universal extent and prevalence. The only exception seems to have been the Jewish worship of one God, whether in its chief seat, the small pro-

---

\* Heidenthum und Judenthum, pp. 468, 480.

† Ibid. p. 344.

‡ Ibid. p. 312.

vince of Judæa, or as it was seen in the lives of Jewish settlers scattered throughout the empire. It must be remarked that this Jewish worship of the true God was sanctioned as that of a national god belonging to the Jews, and sacrifice was perpetually offered for Augustus in the Temple at Jerusalem. But the Jews did not, as a rule, make efforts to convert the Gentiles to their religion, nor seek to exhibit it as antagonistic to the prevailing idolatry, and as claiming to subdue and cast it out. They were content to keep their own worship to themselves, and with the toleration which the Roman law thus allowed them. Yet even so in every place where they dwelt in any numbers some of the better heathens were found to be attracted to their worship by the intrinsic beauty of their belief in one God.

2. But such an exception as this hardly made a perceptible break in that continuous mass of evil and falsehood which then surrounded young and old, learned and ignorant, rich and poor, in its grasp. The sea stands in Holy Writ as the well-known image of the world's disobedience to the divine promptings, of its impetuosity and lawlessness. What image is there in nature so striking and awful as the long waves of the Atlantic bearing down in storm upon a helpless ship, and sweeping it upon an iron-bound coast! So broke that wild sea of human error over the individual mind of man. The observer looked round upon all the nations, and it was everywhere the same—a multiplicity of gods filling up the whole circle of human life, many-named, many-natured, but all without truth, purity, and justice; full of violent and sensual deeds, and still viler imaginations. What stay was there for the spirit of man against that universal flood? Its vastness was everywhere. Who was strong enough, who wise enough, to resist what all his fellows accepted? And the struggle of a single soul against it might seem like that of "some strong swimmer in his agony" alone at night amid the waste of waters.

3. For this polytheism was no dormant, otiose power withdrawn into the background and crouching apart from the actions and feelings of daily life. Its presence was indicated in every home by the little images of the Lares; homage was done to it at every table by libations; every house had its consecrated emblems; every street its statues of Hermes and serpents; in the forum there were feasts in honour of the gods; the shops, taverns, and manufactories had little altars on which wine and incense were offered to them; there were idolatrous emblems on the foreheads of the dead, on their funeral pyre, on their tombs. The places of amusement were specially dedicated to the gods; the theatres had representations in

honour of them ; the circus had their images, chairs, carriages, robes borne in procession ; the amphitheatre was consecrated to them, and as being so Tertullian called it " the temple of all demons." So much for private and social life. But not only so. All political acts were bound up with a crowd of religious formalities, and outward signs of divine concurrence ; and were carried on with a ceremonial, every part of which was prescribed as having an exact inward meaning. Then there were continually recurring vows to the gods made for the great, made for private individuals, made for the emperor and his family. Three special ceremonies were used to obtain favours from them or to deprecate calamities, feasts, the solemnly bearing their images on cushions, processions with naked feet.\* To this we must add the priestly colleges, pontifices, flamines, augurs, and magistrates, whether distinct or co-ordinated. Then, besides, consider the magical character of the prayers, and the strict use of formularies without mistake, omission, or addition, which were supposed to insure success apart from the intention of those offering them. Thus the whole life of the Romans was filled with invocations, propitiations, purifications, and even in any small matter a whole string of gods had prayer and service offered to them, and no one of their names might be omitted. Consider again the great frequency of the offerings, whether propitiative or consultatory ; and, further, how particular beasts belonged to particular gods. The mere expense of victims was felt as a great burden. It was reckoned that on the accession of Caligula 160,000 animals, chiefly oxen and calves, were sacrificed in the Roman Empire in token of the general joy ; and Augustus and Marcus Aurelius devoted such a multitude of beasts to their sacrifices that what had been said of the former was repeated as to the latter, how the white oxen had written to him, saying, " If you conquer, we are lost." Indications of the will of the gods were to be taken on all occasions ; nothing was to be done in public or private without consulting the auspices. Then there was the institution of the Haruspices, in its two branches of examining the entrails of the victims, and divining the meaning of all prodigies. One is still amazed at the ever-unfading solicitude which the senate showed to have all these things carefully watched—eclipses, rainbows of unusual colours, shooting stars, misbirths human or bestial ; showers of earth, stones, chalk, or ashes ; mice gnawing the golden vessels of a temple, bees swarming on a public place, but especially a shrine touched by lightning. Such things struck senate and

---

\* *Epulæ, lectisternia, nudipedalia.*

people with consternation ; special supplications were ordered to appease the causers of them.\*

These are the external manifestations of polytheism which struck every eye, and affected the mind by their constant recurrence. But if we go beneath the surface and examine the root, we shall find an universal sense in the minds of all men in that day of unseen power over and above the material operations of nature. It was too strong as well as too general and invariable to be called an opinion, and it so acted on the nerves and feelings of men that I term it not so much a logical conviction as a sense of the close contact between man and nature, or rather an unseen power behind the veil of nature and working through it. Various as the forms of idolatry were, Egyptian, Asiatic, Libyan, Greek, or Roman—or again, Iberian, Gallic, German—all teemed with this sense. To the adherents of these religions, one and all, the world was very far from being a mere system of nature governed by general laws ; † it may rather be said that this was precisely what it was not. They looked upon nature in all its forms as an expression of the divine will, and therefore the unusual productions of nature became to them intimations respecting that will. And having lost the guidance of a fixed moral and religious teaching, they were ruled by an ever watchful anxiety to gain acquaintance with that will. On this sense rested the universal belief that it was in man's power to hold intercourse by means of charms, spells, adjurations, with spirits of greater might and knowledge than his own, that is, magic or witchcraft. Hence the evocation of the spirits of the dead to reveal secrets of their prison house, or necromancy. Hence the recurrence to oracles, running through all pagan history, of which there were many scattered through the Roman world, and which after a temporary discredit rose again into name in the time of Hadrian. Not less general was the belief that men and women might be possessed by spirits who ruled their words and actions according to an overmastering will. Then divination existed in endlessly various forms, and of its force we can gather a notion by Cicero's remark that it lay like an oppressive burden on the minds of men, so that even sleep, which should be the refuge from anxieties, became through the meaning attached to dreams the cause of a multitude of cares. ‡ To this must be added the use of sortileges, amulets, and talismans, in countless number and variety ; and

---

\* These incidents are taken from various places in "*Heidenthum und Judenthum*," pp. 531, 549, 550, &c.

† *Champagny, les Antonins*, l. 5, c. 3.

‡ *De Divinat.* ii. 72,

the belief that the actions and fortune of men were swayed by the course of the stars, that is, astrology. It was not the vulgar and ignorant merely whose minds were filled with these things. Scarcely a philosopher, scarcely a statesman, scarcely a ruler can be found whose mind, even if proof against a genuine devotion to a divine providence, was not open to one or more manifestations of the dark mysterious power pressing upon the confines of human life, and every now and then breaking through the veil of visible things with evidences of malignant might. A more determined and unscrupulous conqueror than Sylla, a more genuine philosopher than Marcus Aurelius, a more sagacious user of religion than Augustus, we shall not easily find; yet each of these, like their ordinary countrymen, had this sense of the supernatural and intangible above, beneath, and around them. Sylla, on the eve of any battle, would, in the sight of his soldiers, embrace a small statue of Apollo, which he had taken from Delphi, and entreat it to give an early fulfilment of its promises.\* Marcus Aurelius, in his war with the Marcomanni, collected priests from all quarters to Rome, and was so long occupied in offering rites to their various foreign gods that he kept his army waiting for him. And Augustus watched carefully the most trivial signs, and was distressed if in the morning his left shoe was given to him for his right. Even that Julius before whose genius all men quailed, and whose disbelief of a future state stands recorded at a notable point of Roman history, never mounted a chariot without uttering certain words for good luck and preservation against calamity.† We shall therefore judge most inadequately of the force which the innumerable rites, temples, festivals, pomps, ceremonies, prayers, invocations, priesthoods, sodalities, initiations and mysteries of polytheism exercised upon the minds of men, unless we take into full account that remarkable sense of contact and sympathy between the external world and man—of invisible power betraying itself through palpable agents, whether in reasoning or unreasoning productions, whether in the animal or vegetable world—which served as its basis. The line between religion and superstition in paganism no eye can trace; but at least the foundation of true worship plunged deep out of sight into the secret recesses of abject fear.

4. But what was the moral influence of this multiform, universal, all-embracing, and all-penetrating worship?

Varro, whom Cicero calls the most acute and learned of

---

\* Valerius Max. l. c. 2, 3.

† Merivale's "History of the Romans, ii. 447.

writers, and whose great work in forty-one books he praises as containing the names, classes, offices, and causes of all divine and human things, divided theology into the fabulous, the natural, and the civil. In the first, he said, are many fictions unworthy of the nature and dignity of immortal beings: such as that one god sprung from the head, another from the thigh, another from drops of blood; such, again, as that gods were thieves or adulterers, or became slaves to men. In fact, this fabulous theology attributed everything to them which might happen not merely to a man, but to the most contemptible of men.\* Let us leave what he calls natural theology, which is the discussion of philosophers concerning the physical nature of the gods, and proceed to the third, which he calls civil, and which is that which the citizens, and especially the priests of human communities, are bound to know and administer. This treats of what gods are to be worshipped, and with what rites and sacrifices. The first theology, he says, belongs to the theatre, the second to the universe, the third to the city. S. Augustine, commenting at length upon his division, proves that the first and the third, the fabulous and the civil, are, in fact, identical, since the universe is a divine work, but the theatre and the city works of men. The theatre is indeed made for the city, and the very same gods are ridiculed on the stage who are adored in the temple; the same have games exhibited in their honour and victims sacrificed to them. The images, features, ages, sexes, bearing of the gods in the one and in the other are the same. Thus this fabulous, theatrical, and scenic theology, full of everything vile and criminal, is actually a part of the civil, cohering with it as limb with limb in the same body.†

Conceive, then, every revolting detail of adultery, prostitution, incest, or of dishonesty, or of violence, which the perverted invention of modern writers has ever dressed up for the theatres of great cities in this and other countries. They will perhaps yield in turpitude to that which the theatres of the Roman empire exhibited. But what these theatres represented in mimic action was the exact image, as reflected in a mirror, of what was transacted at the solemn service of the gods in unnumbered temples.‡ The exact image so far as it went, yet stopping short in some respects, for our eye-witness above cited declares that gratitude was due to the actors, inasmuch

---

\* See Varro, quoted by S. Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, lib. vi. 5.

† *De Civ. Dei*, l. vi. 5, 6, 7.

‡ *Illam theatricam et fabulosam theologiam ab ista civili pendere noverunt, et ei de carminibus poetarum tanquam de speculo resultare: et ideo ista exposita, quam damnare non audent, illam ejus imaginem liberius arguunt.—De Civ. Dei, vi. 9; Id. vi. 7.*



as they spared the eyes of men, and did not lay bare upon the theatre all that was hidden within the walls of temples. It was not enough then that all the many games and spectacles in which such things were represented were dedicated to the gods, acted under their especial sanction, even enjoined by them as means of gaining their favour or averting their wrath, which alone would have made them answerable for the immorality so portrayed—not enough, even, that actions of this quality were in the theatres ascribed to the gods who presided over them; but these acts of immorality were not the fictions of poets or the acting of players, but the very substance of the theology itself in which the worship of all these nations was embodied. Priapus appeared to make a laugh on the stage exactly in the costume in which he was worshipped in the temples, or in which he entered into the rites of marriage—a costume of indescribable turpitude, the shame of our human nature. The players on the stage and the statues in the temples equally exhibited Jove bearded and Mercury beardless, Saturn in decrepitude and Apollo in youthful beauty. In the rites of Juno, of Ceres, of Venus, of the mother of the gods, words were uttered and scenes acted such as no decent person would suffer to be spoken or acted before his own mother; or rather they contained, as a portion of themselves, the worst crimes which the theatres represented; nay, crimes which they stopped short of acting, and persons so infamous that they were not tolerated, even on the stage, where yet to take part was a civil dishonour. What, then, was the nature of those rites wherein those were chosen to take a part whom the utmost license of the stage banished from its boards? \* Let us conceive—if such a conception can be adequately represented to the mind—that the vilest drama ever acted upon a modern theatre was being daily carried on in all the churches of Christendom by troops of priests and priestesses, with all the paraphernalia of costliest worship, with prayers, invocation, and sacrifices, as a service acceptable to the Ruler of man's lot, and as an account of what that ruler had Himself done, and of what He loved to be imitated by others. That would be a picture of heathen worship in the time of Augustus; that would be the moral food on which was nurtured that crowd of nations which acknowledged Cæsar's sway; that the conception of divine things wrought into the minds of the hundred millions of men who formed the Roman empire.

---

\* Quæ sunt ergo illa sacra quibus agendis tales elegit sanctitas quales nec thymelica in se admittit obscœnitas.—*Ib.* vi. 7.



Was it surprising that all worshippers of the gods should look for their example rather in Jupiter's actions than in Plato's teaching, or the moral judgments of Cato.\* A nature subject in itself to the sway of passion was stimulated by an authority supposed to be divine to the commission of every criminal excess; and herein lay a strong proof of the malignant and impure character of these gods.

On the other hand, the same eye-witness challenges the defenders of the pagan gods to produce a single instance wherein moral precepts of living were delivered to their worshippers upon divine authority. True, indeed, there were here and there whispers of secret rites in which a pure and chaste life was recommended, but where were the buildings dedicated to the public preaching of such truths? Places there were in abundance consecrated to the celebration of infamous games, rightly termed "Fugalia," since they put modesty and decency to flight, but none where the people might listen to divine commands repressing avarice, ambition, or unchaste desire. Thus with the positive inculcation of all evil, under cover of their own example, was united the negative absence of all moral teaching.†

For even the prayers, which accompanied these sacrifices and this ceremonial, and this lavish exhibition of every human wickedness under divine names, were not addressed for moral goods but for wealth, bodily strength, temporal prosperity. Horace but expresses the general mind when he says—

Sed satis est orare Jovem quæ donat et aufert ;

Det vitam, det opes, æquum mi animum ipse parabo.

(*Epist.* i. 18, 111.)

They were moreover viewed as carrying with them a sort of physical force, not as prevailing through purity of intention in those who offered them. In fact, the gods to whom they were addressed were powers of nature, or malignant and impure powers, but in neither case beings who looked for a moral service from rational creatures.

One other turpitude the Asiatic idolatry added to the Greek and Roman forms. By consecrating the sexual relations themselves in one male and one female god, they effected this crowning connection of idolatry with immorality that unchaste

\* Omnes cultores talium deorum—magis intuentur quid Jupiter fecerit, quam quid docuerit Plato vel censurerit Cato.—*Ib.* ii. 7.

† *Ib.* ii. 6.—Demonstrentur vel commemorentur loca—ubi populi audirent quid dii præciperent de cohibenda avaritia, ambitione frangenda, luxuria refrænanda. See also sec. 28.

acts became themselves acts of sacrifice, and so of worship.\* This is the strange perversion borne witness to by Herodotus, and corroborated by the prophet Jeremiah. A great seat of this worship was the city of Hierapolis, in Syria, where was one of the most magnificent temples of the ancient world, dedicated to Derketo, and rich with the offerings of Arabians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Phœnicians, Cilicians, Cappadocians, and all nations of the Semitic tongue. Nor was this worship confined to the East, for hence, as from a centre, the adherents of the Syrian goddess spread themselves in begging troops over the provinces of the empire. And the worship of Venus at Eryx, and other places in the West, with the thousands of female priestesses dedicated to it, reproduced the same abomination.

As the great result of all that we have said, we find the notion of sanctifying the human will absent from the religious rites of the polytheistic idolatry in all its forms. To this corresponded the absence of the notion of holiness in the gods. And this leads us finally to the remarkable character which defines it as a whole. This worship was throughout a corruption,† the spoiling, that is, of something good; a turning away from the better to the worse. The worship itself had been originally good. The corruption lay in the alteration of the quality and the object of the worship. Worship had been implanted in man, and prescribed to him. It was at once the need of his nature and the command of Him who gave that nature. It had for it, first, positive institution, and then tradition and custom, and throughout, the conscience, the reason, and the heart of man. The reason of man ever bore powerful witness to the unity of the Godhead; the breaking up of that unity, as exhibited by this idolatrous polytheism, in contradiction to the original prompting and continued witness of the reason, is a very strong proof of that moral corruption in the will which first generated it, which continued its existence, and which, while multiplying, degraded its forms from age to age. But man was free to decline from the good in which he had been placed. The corruption which was left in his power he exerted; he changed the quality of the service, and the person served. The productive cause of idolatry on the part of man was the soul of man turning away from the notion of a good and holy Creator, the contemplation of whom

---

\* See Heidenthum und Judenthum, p. 398. Herod. i. 199. Baruch, vi. 42-3.

† See S. Athan. *con. Gentes*, 5—9. In like manner S. Theophilus, lib. i. *ad Autolyc.* c. 2.

was its present support and future reward, to visible things. Of these things the chief were bodily pleasures. Thus this corruption of the soul, in process of time, and continually becoming worse, produced this whole pantheon of gods, originally the creation of its own lusts, and subsisting as a perpetual food and support of those lusts. For this cause it had broken up the one perfect idea of God the Creator and Ruler of all persons and things into a multitude of gods, whose functions became more and more divided, until the ether, the air, the earth, and the water swarmed with these supposed beings, which took possession even of wood and stone, dwelling in the statues erected to them; and every desire which the soul in its corruption could entertain had its corresponding patron, helper, and exemplar. In this descending course cause and effect were perpetually re-acting on each other, and as the corruption of the human soul had generated these gods, so their multiplication and degradation intensified its corruption from age to age.\*

5. But this was not all. If corrupt affection in man himself, if the charm of representing the unseen objects of worship in visible characters of wood or stone, if, finally, the ignorance of the true God, together with the beauty of the creature substituted for Him,† were the disposing causes within man to idolatry, there was a cause outside of him which must not be forgotten. When we look upon this idolatry, occupying not one country or race, but all; not merely bewildering savage or uncivilized man, but throned in the chief seats of the world's choicest civilization; when we look upon its endlessly divergent forms, its palpable contradictions, its cherished or commanded immoralities, its crowd of debasing, irrational, heterogeneous superstitions, its cruelty, sensuality, and fearfulness, all these being no less an insult to man's reason than a derogation from God's majesty, who is there that does not feel this to be the strangest and most astonishing sight which history presents to man? And yet there is a unity which runs through it all, and stamps it with a double mark. Not only is it a service due from man to God, which is paid by him to the creature rather than to the Creator,‡ but more especially

---

\* In order to form a notion how far this division of gods could descend, and what an incredible depth of turpitude it reached, see de Civ. Dei, l. vi. c. 9, de officiis singulorum deorum. Its foulness prevents any adequate representation of it.

† See S. Thomas "Summa," 2, 2, q. 94, a. 4.

‡ Of this whole Polytheism in the mass S. Paul pronounces the judgment : — "Οἱ τινες μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει, καὶ ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα."—Rom. i. 25. And the Psalmist

it is that service paid by man to God's enemies, the fallen angels. These it is who have assumed the mask of dead men; these it is who within the sculptured forms of Jupiter, Juno, Mars, and Venus, of Baal and Derketo and Mylitta, of Anubis and Serapis, of Thor and Woden, and so many more, receive man's adoration, and rejoice above all things in possessing his heart. These it is who have seduced him by exhibitions of visible beauty, have lain in wait for him by fountain, forest, and field, and filled the groves and high places with the charms which best pleased him under the name of worship; or have promised to disclose future things to him; or, again, have harrowed his soul with phantasms and terrors of the unseen world. These incoherent systems; these deities, whose functions ran into and athwart each other; these investings of human passions, and even unnatural and monstrous vices, with immortality and terrible power; these rivals ever quarrelling with each other, and jealous for the possession of man's homage, all serve the purpose of those behind the scenes, are puppets under their command, and have a common end and result in the captivity of their victim. More even than this; while they seem disunited and contradictory, they are really one, marshalled by the power, directed by the mind, held in the hand of him who is called "the ruler of this world," the power of darkness," "the might of the enemy," who "holds the power of death," "the ancient serpent, who leads into error the whole world," "that malignant one in whom the whole world is lying," "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit who now works in the children of disobedience," who musters "the principalities, the powers, the world-rulers of this life's darkness, the spirits of wickedness in ætherial places," to serve him in his conflict with man's flesh and blood; in fine, for S. Paul's language goes one point even beyond that of his Master, and terms him not merely the ruler, but "the God of this world." \* This manifold idolatry is the establishment of his kingdom, the enthronement of his godhead over men, the mark of their captivity and prostration before him.

The statements of our Lord and his apostles being so express and definite as to the existence of this diabolic kingdom, and as to the personal sway of a sovereign over it, let us look once more at this idolatry itself by the light thus shed upon it.

---

adds :—"Ὅτι πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαίμονια, ὁ δὲ Κύριος τοῦς οὐρανοῦς ἐποίησεν."—*Sept.* xcv. 5. See also *Ps.* cv. 37.

\* See John xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11; Luke xxii. 53; x. 19; Apoc. xii. 9; Heb. ii. 14; 1 John v. 18; Ephes. vi. 12; ii. 2; 2 Cor. iv. 3.

And, first, whether we regard men as made to be members of a well-ordered society, enjoying temporal prosperity in this life, or as further intended for happiness in a future life, resulting from their present actions,\* the condition in which the heathen nations are actually found at our Lord's coming is quite unintelligible unless we suppose the reality of a diabolic power exercised upon them. The polytheism which we have witnessed holding all human life in its grasp, while it did not teach and uphold the great laws of morality, did, on the other hand, actively inculcate the violation of those laws by continually representing to the minds and eyes of men such a violation in the acts of the deities worshipped. It was a perpetual incitement of men to crimes, as well against social order as against all the sanctities of private life; it fostered the savageness of slavery, and the utmost cruelty in carrying on war, because its deities, being diverse for every nation and belonging exclusively to the nation, had obliterated the idea that all men were of one blood, and thus delivered over the captive and the slave to the pitiless hatred or equally pitiless luxury of their fellow-men. So much for its action on human society as terminating with this life, while for a life to come it had no doctrine and made no preparation, but had suffered the earlier teaching of a future retribution to be considered as a fable fit for children and old women. Looking at such a condition of human society from the moral point of view, we may conclude with certainty that man would never, if left to himself, have devised it.

Secondly, regarding this polytheism as an object presented to the human intellect, nothing more unreasonable and monstrous than this crowd of deities can even be conceived. The human reason demands imperatively the unity of the godhead, since infinite power at least enters into the conception of the godhead, and to divide or limit infinity is an unreason. All the great works and order of the world bore witness likewise to this unity of the godhead, and were sufficient to prove it,† and even in the worst times of paganism we find this proof exhibited with a force and lucidity to which even now little can be added. And in the worst times again we find the natural witness of the human soul breaking out in moments of sudden trial or great anguish, and calling upon

---

\* These two subjects occupy respectively the first five and the second five books of S. Augustine's "City of God," where the argument is carried out in great detail.

† Rom. i. 20. —See the Stoical argument for the unity of the deity in Cic. de Nat. Deor. 2.

the one God for help.\* Yet in spite of this we see whole nations renowned for their intellectual productions, and men among them in whom the force of reason has rarely or never been surpassed, bowing their necks to this yoke of polytheism, and accepting this tissue of monstrous error, paying homage to it in their life, and dying with it on their lips. We know not how to account for this, were man's reason left alone. We can see an adequate ground for it only in "men having been made unreasonable, and in the demoniacal error overshadowing the earth, and concealing the knowledge of the true God."†

Let us take a third view of it, neither the moral nor the logical, but the view of it as an existing fact, as something which for many hundred years occupied the earth, ruled nations, moulded the institutions and characters of men. Here we do not speak merely of the multitude of temples, of priests or priestesses serving in them, of sacrifices offered by these, of prayers, vows, festivals in honour of the gods, because all these enter into the notion of a service rendered by man to the power superior to him, and in their utmost perversion there is nothing which may not be accounted for by a simply human corruption stealing into and spoiling an originally good institution; but all these in the actual condition of paganism were mixed up with and penetrated by other elements, and accompanied by effects not to be so accounted for. Let us take the universal persuasion that the statues of the gods were inhabited by the deities which they represented, as bodies by souls.‡ Here was the notion of a spiritual power taking possession of material forms. But how was this notion introduced, propagated, and maintained in men's minds? By certain visible and palpable effects,§ of which those who were eyewitnesses give us many details. Take again the oracles which existed throughout the heathen world, and as dealing with the same subject matter, divination in all its forms. However much of deceit there might be here, was there not also, in many instances, an exhibition of power and knowledge

---

\* Tertullian, de Testimonio Animæ, 2.

† Οὕτω τοίνυν ἀλογωθίντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ οὕτω τῆς δαιμονικῆς πλάνης ἐπισκιαζούσης τὰ πανταχῶν, καὶ κρυπτούσης τὴν περὶ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ γνῶσιν. —*S. Athan. De Incar.* 13.

‡ See *S. Aug. de Civ. Dei*, viii. 24. Immundi spiritus, eisdem simulacris arte illa nefaria colligati, cultorum suorum animas in suam societatem redigendo miserabiliter captivaverant.

§ Called by *S. Athan.*:—"ἡ τῶν δαιμόνων ἀπάτη—μανία—φαντάσιαι." Thus, *De Inc.* 47:—"παλαι μὲν δαίμονες ἐφантаσιασκοποῦν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, προκαταλαμβάνοντες πηγὰς ἢ ποταμούς, ἢ ξύλα, ἢ λίθους, καὶ οὕτω ταῖς μαγανείαις ἐξέπληττον τοὺς ἄφρονας. Νῦν δὲ τῆς θείας ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Λόγου γεγεννημένης, πέπνυται τούτων ἡ φαντασία."



beyond that of man, which no mere deceit could produce? Take again magic, the invocation, adjuration, and compacting with spirits, which ran through heathen society in numberless shapes; and take lastly the fact of spirits seizing upon and possessing the bodies of men, speaking by their voice and controlling their minds. The four classes which we have just given comprehend in themselves an innumerable multitude of facts which are apparent in pagan history, in all which the corruption of the human soul is an agent or patient, but for which that corruption by itself supplies no adequate cause. A spiritual power is behind laying hold of and acting upon this corruption, and by fault of the human will making an inroad into the visible world, and partially mastering it, bending it to an evil purpose, and making it serve as an agent to man's captivity. Let us briefly cite as to the reality of this spiritual power the witness of its victims and the witness of its opponents.

First, as to its victims. Scarcely a writer, whether poet, historian, philosopher, or biographer, can be found among the heathens of Greece and Rome who does not attest facts belonging to one or more of these four classes which surpass human power, and suggest an invisible spiritual agency. The poet who writes expressly to deny such an agency speaks of the whole world as bowed beneath the fear of it; another poet,\* referring tacitly to this very passage, felicitates the man not who has a pure conscience, but who through knowledge of natural things has trampled these fears under his feet. Nor is such a belief confined to the vulgar; but scarcely a man of eminence, a soldier, or a statesman can be cited who does not in his life and actions acknowledge it, shrink from it, or cower beneath it. It is too powerful for Alexander or even Julius to escape; and the philosophers who affect to deny it in their systems exhibit it in their conduct. They have all the conviction of an evil power beyond and above nature, but taking hold of natural forms, and ever lying in wait to burst forth from them upon human life. The Greek name for superstition is fear of the demons; and what S. Paul said of the Athenians that he found them in all things too fearful of the demons

---

\* *Humana ante oculos fœde quam vita jaceret  
In terris, oppressa gravi sub religione, &c.*

Luc. i. 63.

*Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,  
Atque metus omnes et inexorabile fatum  
Subjecit pedibus, strepitumque Acherontis avari.*

Virg. Geo. ii. 491.



might be applied to the whole circle of nations surrounding the midland sea.

Secondly, as to the opponents of this power. Now they offer a triple witness to its existence. The first of these is in the facts mentioned in the New Testament. The strongest, most terrible, and most inexplicable instance of this power lies in those diabolical possessions with which so many of our Lord's miracles are concerned. Again, as to the reality of divining powers arising from the presence of a demon in a human form, we have the evil spirit in the girl at Philippi acknowledging in S. Paul a servant of the most high God, and when cast out by the Apostle, in the name of Christ, leaving his victim destitute of those powers which had brought gain to her masters, who forthwith try to avenge themselves for their loss by exciting a persecution against the Apostle.\*

A second witness is found in the rites and offices of the very power set up to dethrone and abolish this other power. The Church called upon every one who was received into her bosom to begin by renouncing the usurpation of this great enemy, which was thus declared to be universal. She provided forms for exorcising him. One of her Apostles warned those to whom he wrote that men could not partake at once of the Christian sacrifice and the heathen, for as truly as one was the chalice of the Lord the other was the chalice of devils; as one was the table of the Lord, the other was the table of devils.†

A third witness is found in the unanimous testimony of all Christian writers as to the reality of the demoniacal powers with which they were waging war; as to their perpetual interference with human life; as to the open and palpable effects which they produced; as to their unwilling retirement in the face of that Stronger One who was come upon them. It was not merely the fervid Tertullian who offered to rest the truth of Christianity and the life of any ordinary Christian upon his power publicly to expel a demon. Athanasius, who weighs every word he utters, says also, "Let him who will, try the truth of what we have said, and in the very presence of the spectral illusion of the demons, of the deceit of oracles, and the wonders of magic, let him use the sign of the cross derided by them, only naming the name of Christ, and he shall see how by him the demons fly, the oracles cease, and every sort of magic and witchcraft is annulled." No less express is

---

\* Acts xvi. 16.

† 1 Cor. x. 21.

S. Augustine in acknowledging the reality of these dark powers, and the wonders worked by them.\*

Resuming then for a moment our view of heathenism as a whole, with regard to the exhibition of diabolic power in it, let us bear in mind, joined to the absence of moral teaching, its flagrantly immoral character; secondly, its illogical character, by which it is an insult to human reason while yet accepted by the human will; and thirdly, the super-human effects noted in it and attached to its rites, ceremonies, and practices, attested by many generations alike of its victims as of its opponents. These proofs have each their own separate force, but they have likewise as to our conclusion a cumulative force, and its result is, that the existence of a diabolic kingdom and sovereign throned in heathenism, pervading its rites, and directing its operations, which is so expressly declared in holy writ, is no less strongly proved by the facts of history.

6. Now having sketched in four main points the substance of this polytheism, its multiplicity, its universality, its hold upon daily life, and its moral corruption, to all which a consummating force is added by the indwelling of diabolic power, it remains to give a glance at certain conditions and circumstances under which it was acting on the minds of men. We have here taken it and examined it by itself, abstracting it from those circumstances, but it never so appeared to those who lived under it. The wonderful error which so enfolded these wide-spread nations never exhibited itself to them bare and naked. On the contrary it came to them interwoven with the dearest claims of the family, the city, the country, with the force of habit and tradition, with the dread of change, with the past history and future hopes of their fatherland, coloured moreover with the radiant dress of a rich and ever advancing civilization.

To judge of its power, vitality, and chance of permanence we must look at it under these conditions. And if, when we regard this idolatrous polytheism in itself, one is lost in wonder at its ever having arisen, at its existence, at its continuance, so, when one regards it as throned in the customs, feelings, convictions, and interests, of society, one wonders how any

---

\* Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, 23; S. Athanas. *de Inc.*, 48; S. Aug. *de Civ. Dei*, xxi. 6, who says, "Ut autem demones illiciantur ab hominibus, prius eos ipsi astutissima calliditate seducunt, vel inspirando eorum cordibus virus occultum, vel etiam fallacibus amicitiiis apparendo, eorumque paucos discipulos suos faciunt, plurimorumque doctores. Neque enim potuit, nisi primum ipsis doctentibus, disci quid quisque illorum appetat, quid exhorreat, quo invitetur nomine, quo cogatur, unde magicæ artes earumque artifices exstiterunt."

moral force could ever overthrow it. At the present time not only are there religions outside of Christianity, but there are also sects within it, so irrational, so devoid of the witness given by internal truth and harmony, so unable to render any account of themselves and their claims which will satisfy a mind looking for consistency, that, regarding them merely as facts, one cannot account for them, yet notwithstanding they may have existed for several hundred years, and had a large share in forming national habits of thought, or even national character; nay, perhaps their secret strength lies in some fold of this character itself. And because they are never seen by themselves, their intrinsic absurdity does not come before their adherents, and the last thing which these think of examining is the foundation of their sect, inasmuch as in fact it has never approached them otherwise than as a condition of their daily life. So we shall understand paganism better by considering it as interwoven with civilization, polity, and national feelings. We will treat of it briefly under these three heads:—

1. First, the whole eastern part of the Roman empire was made up of many various nations having a long and sometimes renowned history, kingdoms, and polities much anterior to Rome herself, of which the Romans had taken violent possession, but wherein remained still the fruits of a rich and undisturbed civilization. And this word comprehends all the natural life of man, all the discoveries gained by his invention or experience, and accumulated by wealth descending from age to age, all the manifold ties of social intercourse, all the pleasures of the intellect, united, moreover, in their case with an art even now unrivalled in portraying the beauty of the human figure, and in the elegance with which it adapted material forms to the conveniences of life. So rich and varied an inheritance unfolded itself in a thousand Hellenic cities studying the shores of the Mediterranean. The culture itself since the time of Alexander might be termed Hellenic, but it embraced Egypt, and Syria, and all western Asia. And so completely was idolatrous polytheism interwoven with culture, so inextricably was it blended with the bulk, so gradually had it grown with the growth, and wound its fibres about the tree and the branches, that the worship might be absolutely identified with the civilization. The gods of Greece were the heads of the most illustrious Grecian families; their hero-worship consecrated every city, every grove, every field. The gods of Egypt were blended with the long renown of the Nile-land, with every Egyptian custom, with the beginning and the end of life. Not less had the gods of Syria and Western Asia

occupied their respective lands. These deities struck their root into the home of man, into the union of the sexes, into the loves of parent and child, of brother and sister. They had their mementos in every street of busy traffic; they watched over the Acropolis; not a fountain but laid claim to their patronage, nor a field which was fruitful, but by their supposed influence. These countries had lost their political independence, but the material ease of life under the majesty of the Roman name they retained. There was a passionate love for this world's goods, comforts, and enjoyments in the Greek, Syrian, Asiatic, Egyptian, and Libyan races, all of them more or less worn, and effete, and deeply sensualized; but their glory was this great Hellenic civilization, with which polytheism might be termed one and the same thing.

2. When we turn to the West, the seat of the sovereign city and of the empire itself, we find that from the very beginning and through many centuries the political constitution of the city had been indissolubly blended with the worship of the Roman gods. The religion of Rome was much more than national; her polity seemed only another name for her worship. Her temples were as much a part of her political life as her forum. So far at least she had embodied in her whole structure the legend of her Etruscan teacher, wherein the dwarf Tages sprung from the soil to communicate the worship claimed by the gods.\* Her soil and her worship were indivisible. And even after seven centuries, when the city was embracing the world in its arms, this union practically existed. Rome indeed admitted, as we have said, the gods of the conquered nations into her pantheon, but it was on the same tenure as the nations themselves shared her civic rights. Jupiter Capitolinus was a sort of suzerain not only to the gods of the Grecian Olympus, but to the dark forms of the Nile deities, to the Syrian, the Libyan, the Gallic, the Germanic, the Sarmatian Valhalla. When the greatest of her poets would express unending duration, he joins together the race of Æneas enthroned on the Capital with the god who dwelt there:—

Nulla dies unquam memori vos eximet ævo,  
Dum domus Æneæ Capitoli immobile saxum  
Accolet, imperiumque Pater Romanus habebit.

The Roman father is the Capitoline Jupiter. I am not a king; the only king of the Romans is Jupiter, said the most royal of the race, and the founder of her empire, when, seeing all

---

\* Merivale, iii. 496.

prostrate at his feet, he put away reluctantly the diadem offered by his creature. Thus even he who had seized the reality of power, who would have omens when he pleased, and whose will was his law, left the crown on the head of Jupiter. In Rome all through her history "piety and patriotism were the same feeling."\* When her empire became world-wide, this sort of devotion did not cease. Rome had long been deified, and the double import of her name† expressed strength against the foe without, and nourishment to the child within. She was at once a warrior goddess clothed in mail to meet the enemy, and a mother offering her bosom to her citizens clustered around her. And so in her new constitution, adapted for the world, her emperor too was deified, as the first of her children, her living representative, the embodiment of her force and love, the visible wielder of her unseen power. All that is sacred in home and country to us the Roman signified when he swore by the genius of the Emperor. Nothing could be more tolerant than this polytheism, if the innovation extended only to the borrowing or creating a new divinity, to reforming a rite or a ceremony,‡ or to such like modifications of worship which admitted that on which it rested; but nothing more intolerant than the same polytheism when the worship itself was attacked. A movement against the Capitoline Jupiter would be not only sacrilege but high treason, and the refusal to call to witness the emperor's genius was in fact to deny his imperial authority. The worship of the gods was as much identified with the empire of Rome in the West as with the civilization of Greece throughout the East.

3. But as if these two powers were not ties sufficiently strong to hold polytheism together, there was another feeling distinct from both, which formed its last bulwark. The iron hand which held in its grasp these vast countries, many of them so large that by themselves they might have been empires, was strong enough to prevent or crush insurrection, but provided only the majesty of the Roman peace was accepted, did not seek to disturb a large remnant of local feeling and interest still representing the former life and polity of the several provinces. Now whatever of national, tribe, or race feeling existed, was grouped everywhere about the worship of the native gods.§ The Nile-land had ceased to be a royal seat, and was governed by a simple Roman knight as prefect of the emperor, but not for this had the Nile gods abdicated their

---

\* Beugnot, *Destruction du Paganisme*, i. 8.

† *ῥώμη*, strength; *ruma*, a mother's breast.

‡ Beugnot, i. 17.

§ *Οἱ ἐγχώριοι θεοί*.

dark sway over their votaries. In them the Egyptians still felt that they had something which was their own. Thus, whatever force of patriotism still lurked in the several parts of the empire was nurtured by its own form of polytheism, which it in turn invested with the memories dearest and most ineradicable in man, of past independence or renown. Not only the Egyptians, but the various Asiatic and Libyan races, the Gauls and Germans under Roman sway, were thus attached to their native gods with a feeling no doubt akin to that of the English towards "Old England," or the Russians towards "Holy Russia."

4. Two more conditions of society throughout the whole empire we have yet to consider in their bearing on the maintenance of polytheism; first, the concentration of the vast power of the state—in itself an acknowledged omnipotence, without restriction or reservation of individual rights—in one hand, the hand of the emperor, the sole representative of the people. By this it would seem that all the upper classes of society, the classes at ease as to their maintenance, the classes who have leisure to think and will to act in political matters, were deprived of so much of their freedom, and such deprivation would tend to support an existing institution. Secondly, the despotism above was met by a corresponding despotism below. The rights of the slaveholder over the human labourer left as little margin of freedom to daily toil as the right of the imperial autocrat to the freedom of conscience in the rich. The servants throughout the world of Rome being slaves, were as much in the hand of their masters as those masters were in the hand of the prince.

We can now take a prospect of human society in reference to the polytheism of the empire from the standing-point of Augustus in the last twenty years of his reign. The worship of her gods was so intertwined with the political constitution of Rome from her birth through seven centuries and a half, that it might be said to be one thing with it. Almost as close was the identification of the several religious systems of the East with the enjoyments of civilized life which they prized so highly, and which the empire of Rome secured to them. Further in the background the national gods of the many races included in the empire were the last inheritance of their former independent life. Again, not only was the emperor as Pontifex Maximus the official head of this polytheism, but as representing the whole power of the state, he was its guardian, and whatever assailed it was an insult to the majesty which he embodied; while the slavery in which the masses were lying seemed to represent in human society the chances of war



which had all ended in the dominion of Rome and the subjection of the whole Pantheon of incongruous gods to the sovereignty of the Capitoline Jupiter. These were general conditions to that multifarious whole of nations and races. Then if Augustus sought to examine more narrowly the society of Roman citizens spread through his empire, he would find it divided very unequally as to numbers into two classes. The vast majority were those who take things as they find them, and who belonged with more or less fidelity and heartiness to the idolatrous polytheism. The worship which came to them as part and parcel of the empire, of civilized and of national life, they accepted without thought. To all these an indefinite number of immoral gods was throned in possession of Olympus: to all these the result of such worship was, as we have seen described by S. Augustine, the utter perversion of morality, the consecration of fables equalling in turpitude the utmost license of the theatres. But everywhere among the educated classes were to be found a small number of sceptical minds: philosophers they termed themselves: it was fashionable to follow some philosophic system or sect, and these fell mainly into two. Now the Epicureans and the Stoics, while they left the existing polytheism in practical possession, as a matter of custom and state religion, and so delivered themselves from any unpleasant consequences of denying the prevailing worship, concurred entirely in this, that the one by the way of atheism, the other by that of pantheism, destroyed all religion of the heart and inner conduct; because they equally removed the notion of a personal God, and its corresponding notion of a personal being in man outliving the body and the world of sense, and meeting with a personal retribution. Whether the power they acknowledge be nature, as in Lucretius, or a hidden physical force running through all nature, which might be called Jupiter, Juno, Hercules, or the name of any other god, as in Marcus Aurelius, the notion of a personal Creator, provident and rewarding, was equally destroyed. Nor before the preaching of the gospel does there appear a single individual who drew out of the existing polytheism such a conclusion. On the contrary, in Augustus and his successors the imperial idea of unity in religion was to make out that all these systems of polytheism, running into and athwart each other, came practically to the same thing, differing in name only. Their obedience to Jupiter of the Capitol was the only bond of unity, and pledge of the empire's duration, conceived by the Roman rulers.

II. Thus in the time of Augustus no human eye, whether we look at the mass of mankind or the thinking few, could see



any sign either that the dominant polytheism was about to fall, or that the lost doctrine of the divine Unity and Personality could be extricated from the bewildering mass of error and superstition which had grown over, disguised, and distorted it. Darker still, if possible, became the prospect under his successor, Tiberius, whose reign had reached the climax of moral debasement, when Sejanus was all powerful at Rome. Hope for the human race there appeared none, when such an emperor devolved his omnipotence on such a prime minister. Then in the judgment hall of a procurator in a small and distant eastern province, there passed the following dialogue between an accused criminal and his judge:—"Pilate went into the Prætorium again, and called Jesus, and said to him, 'Art thou the king of the Jews?' Jesus answered him, 'Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or have others told it thee of me?' Pilate answered, 'Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee up to me: what hast thou done?' Jesus answered, 'My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would strive that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now my kingdom is not from hence.' Pilate therefore said to him, 'Art thou a king, then?' Jesus answered, 'Thou sayest that I am a king. For this was I born, and for this came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice. Pilate saith to him, 'What is truth?'" He who thus declared himself to be a king, the cause of whose birth and advent into the world, the function of whose royalty, was to bear witness to the truth, received from the power which then ruled the world the punishment allotted to the slave who was worthy of death. For many ages a false worship had overshadowed the earth, hiding the true God from men, and setting up instead a multitude of demons for gods. And during this time the thinkers of Greek and Roman society had been asking, What is truth? And now the officer who asked that question of the Truth Himself, replied to it by crucifying Him. And when the body of that Crucified One was the same day taken down from the cross and laid in its sepulchre, the power which reigned in polytheism and spoke by the mouth of the judge, seemed to have given the final answer of triumphant force to its question, What is truth? and falsehood might be thought to reign supreme and victorious in the world.

It was with the resurrection of that Body, in which Truth was enshrined, that the resurrection of truth among men began. He had said to his disciples a few hours before, not "I show the truth," but "I am the Truth." His birth and his advent

took place that his witness might be given to it, the witness to it being that very birth and advent, his appearance among men, and the reception He would meet with. The crucifixion itself—the reply of triumphant force to its own unanswered question—was the witness which, first in Him, and then in His followers, should make itself heard over the earth now held in captivity by falsehood. And since Truth is His proper Name and His personal Being from eternity, and by being the Truth He who spoke is the second Person in the Godhead, the perfect Image of all Truth, let us consider the import of His Name as the summing up of the great antagonism which He then planted on the earth.

For He named Himself the Truth because He is the Son and the Word of the Father. “Thus the Father, as it were uttering Himself, begot His Word, equal to Himself in all things. For He would not fully and perfectly have uttered Himself, if there were anything less or anything more in His Word than in Himself. . . . And therefore this Word is truly the Truth; inasmuch as whatever is in that knowledge of which He is begotten, is also in Himself; and whatsoever is not in it, is not in Himself. . . . The Father and the Son know each other, the one by generating, the other by being generated.”\* Thus it is that He is the perfect Word, the absolute Image of God; and being the Image of God He created man in the beginning a copy of that Image, and according to its resemblance, in that He created him in the indivisible unity of a soul intelligent and willing—a created copy of the Trinity in Unity. But though by the original constitution of the soul this copy could not be destroyed, being the very essence of the soul, yet the resemblance might be marred, and the harmony which reigned in the original man between the soul its intellect and will, through the indwelling of God’s Spirit, was broken by the act of sin; whereupon that Spirit withdrew from him, and left the copy of the divine Image defaced and disordered. All the heathenism we have been considering is the sequence of that disorder, part of which is the grievous obscuration of truth, that is, of the whole relation between God and man, of which idolatrous polytheism is the perversion. It was the exact representation of the soul’s own disorder, being the distortion but not the extinction of worship; the fear of many demons, instead of the fear of one God; slavish instead of filial fear.

But as the Truth of the Father is beheld and expressed in generating His Son, His Word, His perfect Image, so truth to

---

\* S. Aug. de Trin. l. 15, c. 14, tom. 8, 984.

man is the resemblance of created things to the archetypal idea of them in God; the resemblance of the works of the divine art to the Artificer's intention. In this long act of heathenism we see the work of the divine Artificer marred and obscured, and the marring and obscuration seem to have gone as far as was possible without touching the essence of the soul. Who then should restore, but He who had first created? Who should give back to the copy the lost harmony, and reimprint the defaced resemblance, save the perfect Image of God? Thus, when the corruption had run its course, and the original disobedience had reproduced itself all over the earth in a harvest of evil and disorder, the time for the work of reparation was come, and the Divine Word, the Image of the Father, took flesh.

Magnificent as had been the dower of the First Man, and wonderful the grace which held his soul in harmony with itself, and his bodily affections in obedience to his soul, incomparably more magnificent was the dower of human nature in its reparation, inconceivably grander the grace which ruled the Soul and Body of the Restorer. For whereas the First Man's person had been simply human, the Person of the Second Man was the Divine Word Himself, the perfect Image of the Father; and whereas the grace of the First Man was such that he was able not to sin, the grace which had assumed the nature of the Second Man was a Person who could not sin, the fountain of grace itself, measureless, absolute, and personal. The Image of God Himself came to restore the copy of that Image in man, his appearance as man among men was the reconveying of the Truth to them, because He was the Truth Himself. The Truth in all its extent; the Truth in the whole moral order and every relation which belongs to it; the Truth by which all the rational creation of God corresponds to the Idea of its Creator, was the gift which He brought to man in His Incarnation.

But this truth is not merely external to man. In order to be received and appropriated by him, he must become capable of it. The Restorer works his restoration by an inward act upon the soul, its intellect and will. The Image of God sets up His seat within His work, the copy. Man is sealed by the Holy Spirit with the likeness and resemblance of the Father's Face, the Son; and having the Son within him, and giving a home within the soul to the divine character, and making this his treasure, man is formed after God.\* The supreme likeness, which is beyond all others, is impressed on human souls

---

\* *S. Cyril Alex.* tom. v. 1, pp. 544, 557, a.

by the Spirit of the Father and the Son. As the defacing of the likeness, the result of the original fall, caused the obscuring of the Truth, so its restoration was itself the recovery of the Truth.

And this restoration is itself the witness to the Truth of which He spoke before Pilate as the object of His birth and advent. But to make the witness operative and fruitful, the greatest wonder in this list of wonders is required, the suffering of the Truth Himself. He said of the corn of wheat, which was to bear fruit in unnumbered hearts, that it would remain alone unless it fell into the ground and died. And so His crucifixion in the nature which He had assumed was the act from which the renewal of truth went forth; and not only in His Person, but likewise in His chosen witnesses this special mode of vivifying the truth, and making it fruitful, should be repeated. Not only must the absolute Truth of God appear in our nature itself in order to be accepted, but the nature in which it appeared should offer the sacrifice of itself, and this particular mode of propagating the truth should be observed in that chosen band whom He termed specially His witnesses. Their witness should be their suffering; in them, too, the Truth should be crucified, and so become fruitful.

And as man in his original creation had been a copy, however faint, of the eternal relations of the Godhead in itself, so his restoration springs from those same eternal relations. In it the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are seen working.\* It springs from the Father, in that He is the Father of the only begotten Son, the Original of the Image, and so the Father of all those who are the copies of that Image. It springs from the Son, in that He is the perfect Image of the Father, and by dwelling in a created nature has raised it to the dignity of His Person, from which the grace of Sonship comes. It springs from the Holy Spirit, whose work as the Spirit of the Father and the Son, is to imprint the copy of the Son on man. He performs in every one of the redeemed by communicating to them a participation of the divine nature, by dwelling in them, by contact and coherence with them, a work infinitely less in degree, but yet of the same order with that work of His whereby all the fullness of the Godhead dwelt by personal unity in our Lord's Manhood.†

But we left our Lord before Pilate, bearing witness to the truth. It remains to see how that truth became impressed on the world.

---

\* S. Cyril Alex. in Joh. x. p. 858, b.      † Petav. de Trin., Lib. viii. c. 7.

## ART. V.—ARCHBISHOP MANNING ON ENGLAND AND CHRISTENDOM.

*England and Christendom.* By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. London : Longmans.

**T**HERE is probably no Catholic writer towards whom Anglicans in general and Tractarians in particular exhibit so much aversion as towards the Archbishop. If you ask their reason for this, they will be sure to reply that he is so narrow and exclusive ; that he is so slow in seeing any good externally to the Roman Catholic Church ; that he is so harsh and uncharitable in his judgment of those outside his own communion. It is very natural they should make this reply, because it supplies (so to speak) a moral basis for their antipathy : since it may well be accounted a moral defect that any one should be slow in appreciating and sympathizing with love of God, wherever that love may be found. But it is really not less than monstrous to accuse the Archbishop, as distinct from others belonging to his own communion, of any approach to this habit of mind. On the contrary, we will venture to say that there is no one Roman Catholic writer of eminence in the world who has spoken more emphatically than he—we doubt if there is one who has spoken with *equal* emphasis—on the piety and salvability of persons external to the visible Church. Take the two following passages in illustration : how can there possibly be a more frank and cordial justice done to those without ?

First as to the Evangelicals.

The sincere and excellent men who represented this school entirely believed themselves to be the direct opponents of Rationalism. They honestly feared and abhorred it as an impiety towards the Word of God ; little knowing, from want of analyzing their own rule of Faith, that it was also essentially rationalistic. What has been the course and fate of these good men I know not. They seem to have melted away on every side. They do not appear to have replenished their number, nor to have held their ground, nor to have any succession. The so-called Evangelical school appears to have been a form of personal piety which could not perpetuate itself. It contained *a multitude of the highest and noblest English natures*, of whom invincible ignorance of the Catholic Church may be predicated with full confidence. The “Bible” and the “Following of Christ” were their text-books ; and *their lives were singularly conformed to the Catholic type of humility, patience, piety, submission, self-denial, and communion with God.* Baptism had made

them children of God and of His Church ; conscious desire to believe all He had revealed, to obey all He had commanded, and to suffer all He might require, and unconsciousness of a thought in wilful deviation from His Truth, or of an intention at variance with His Will, sustained them in their innocence, or raised them again by repentance to union with their Father in Heaven (pp. xxxii., xxxiii.).

Next on the Tractarian movement : though we cannot do justice to the Archbishop's language on this head, without giving an extract of considerable length.

Truth and justice towards the Anglican system, and a grateful recognition of the working of the Spirit of Grace, demand a full acknowledgment of the change which has passed upon it.

First, came a restoration of Divine worship on festivals and saints' days, extending sometimes even to daily service morning and evening ; and that in the remotest country churches.

Secondly, a restoration of frequent communion ; what was before once a quarter became once a month, once a week, and now, in some places, is every day.

Thirdly, arose one of the noblest and most beneficent works of the Anglican clergy—the education movement, which sprang up in 1837, and has continued to this day.

Fourthly, came the Colonial bishoprics, which have called forth great energy and devotion, and by reaction have powerfully affected the Anglican clergy at home.

Fifthly, sprang up a sense of the need of theological training for clergymen, which, through much opposition and evil report, succeeded at last in forming one or two Diocesan Colleges, and in moving the Universities to a tardy and insufficient endeavour to provide for this obvious need.

Sixthly, a restoration of sacred and religious literature ; first Anglican, then patristic, next mediæval and scholastic, and finally Catholic ; which has penetrated and elevated the Anglican system, both clergy and laity, with a higher knowledge, and with perceptions, aspirations, and sympathies which were extinct in the last century in England, and have their true home only in the ever-living and changeless Church of God. The doctrines taught and believed, the devotions and practices of piety now in use among Anglicans, show that *the mind and spirit of the Church has breathed itself into multitudes who are still in the Anglican system.* Over every instinct that opens in it, every pulse that beats in it, every aspiration which rises in it, every line of conformity to the Catholic Church which is retraced upon it, *I rejoice with all my heart.*

Lastly, there has sprung up in the Anglican Church a consciousness that Protestantism cannot be the essence of its nature, but a mere attitude of supposed and transient necessity. It has become now the acknowledgment of calm and good men among them, that unless the Church of England be Catholic it is nothing ; and that unless it be in substantial agreement of faith with the Christian world, it cannot be Catholic. This is to be found pervading the higher minds and natures of the Anglican clergy. In all this



there is no disloyalty to their position, no unnatural appropriation of Roman doctrines, no unauthorized adoption of the Roman ritual. Of these two last phenomena I will speak hereafter.

So far as I have described the steady ascending of the mind and spirit of the Church of England, *it has my hearty and hopeful sympathy*. I pray that showers of blessings may fall with the early and the latter rain, upon "the land that was desolate," and that the wilderness may "flourish like the lily." Every fresh light which springs up, every gleam of the true faith which spreads over England, *is a cause of thankfulness to the Father of lights, from whom alone it comes*. As I have said in the third of the letters here reprinted, it is a dictate of faith to believe that the Spirit of God is working mightily, sweetly, and wisely in all who are faithful to His grace. The Catholic Church bears the heart of Him, "who will not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax." No one who has a love for souls can look upon this rising of the Spirit of Life in the Anglican system *without a tender and loving care*. I pray God, day by day, to perfect the work which He has begun, and never to stay His hand until He has reunited England to Christendom. Every scattered and isolated truth in the Anglican system is a germ of faith; every measure of grace is an earnest of more. *In proportion as men know and love God they are nearer to the Council of Trent, and to the Vicar of the Incarnate Word* (pp. xl.—xliii.).

It is not only, however, that the Archbishop so warmly sympathizes with the piety of non-Catholic individuals and bodies: he has done much more than this, to give such good men their due place in a Catholic's judgment. For observe.

It has been held by several theologians, that belief in the Church's infallibility is a strictly necessary condition of true faith; and, if this doctrine were true, it would follow of course that no non-Catholic could be saved, however invincible might be his ignorance of Catholicism. This question therefore is simply vital in its bearing on the point before us. We ask then, who is the one Roman Catholic who has taken the most prominent part, in encountering this objection and solving this difficulty? The Archbishop. Several years ago he preached a sermon in Rome, containing the same doctrine which appears in his present volume; viz. (p. 110) that "the infallibility of the Church does not enter of necessity into the essence of an act of faith," though it is the "Divine provision for" faith's "perfection and perpetuity, and the ordinary means whereby men are illuminated in the revelation of God." This sermon caused much excitement and discussion at the time; and it led many both to look more carefully into the matter, and ultimately to change their opinion. We repeat—it was Archbishop Manning who was thus zealous for the doctrine, that individuals can be saved externally to the Church's body; who saw the difficulty which



might plausibly be raised against this opinion, from that tenet which required belief in the Church's infallibility as requisite to Divine faith; and who consequently applied himself to controvert the said tenet expressly and systematically.

What then really causes that Anglican antipathy to his writings, which is so very evident? The cause is not far to seek. He sympathizes with the piety of Evangelicals and Dissenters, no less than with that of High-Churchmen; he regards Anglicans as no less simply external to the visible Church than Wesleyans or Congregationalists; he regards as the merest sham and pretence all attempts at investing the Establishment with a Catholic dress or profession. But then this cannot be represented, with any kind of plausibility, as implying harshness or uncharitableness of temperament; it is a simple matter of theological argument and discussion. And since theological argument and discussion are certainly not the strong point of Anglicans, they are naturally very desirous of shifting the controversy on to some other ground. It is very difficult to answer the Archbishop's arguments; but it is extremely easy to accuse him of a narrow judgment and temper. And yet all this time the real soreness of Anglicans arises, not from his being harsh to *them*, but from his *not* being harsh to their more Protestant *opponents*.

The volume before us embraces four pamphlets, which had been previously put out at intervals since the year 1864; and is preceded by a very important Introduction. The essays have now obtained a peculiar significance, which the author would not have anticipated at first, from the publication of the *Eirenicon*, and the sudden impulse thus given to Unionistic aspirations; and we think we shall best assist our readers to apprehend their purport, if we take them in order of time. We will begin then with the first of the four treatises; go through with them one by one; and conclude, instead of commencing, with the Introduction.

The first pamphlet (pp. 1-32) was published in 1864, on occasion of the Privy Council judgment concerning the notorious "Essays and Reviews"; and it points out in perspicuous but moderate language the real position in which that judgment exhibited the Church of England. The author begins by reciting the resolution published at the time of the Gorham judgment\* by thirteen most influential Anglicans, of whom Dr. Manning was himself one and Dr. Pusey another. This resolution declared in effect, that acquiescence in the said

---

\* This was a judgment deciding that Anglican ministers are permitted to deny Baptismal Regeneration.

judgment would overthrow every claim to Catholicity that could be made for the Church of England; and consequently that it was of indispensable importance, to obtain from the bishops a re-affirmation of the condemned doctrine. Our author then goes on to repeat the history of what subsequently took place. Bishop Blomfield, of London, speedily brought in a bill (p. 8) to vest in the bishops exclusive judgment on matters of doctrine; but the bill was rejected.

It was rejected with an overwhelming rejection, not only of opposition but of arguments. So utter was the defeat that it has never been heard of more. No one has ventured to introduce any like it again. The vice of the whole situation was so visible and so hopeless that it has been left without an attempt to cure it (p. 9).

Ever since this futile and grotesque exhibition, the Church of England has acquiesced without further remonstrance in the final appellate jurisdiction of the Crown; and the very notion of repudiating the Gorham decision has faded from men's minds. An attempt was indeed made to obtain signatures for a declaration, "that the Oath of Supremacy could be taken to oblige the conscience only in matters of a civil and not of a spiritual kind" (p. 12). But how was this declaration received by the clergy? Out of 17,000, some 1,800 signed it. Meanwhile about the same time the Catholic hierarchy was restored to England; and now, no longer one tenth part, but the whole body of Anglican clergy spoke out with emphasis.

The Church of England, bishops, clergy, and laity, in ecclesiastical sections of dioceses, chapters, archdeaconries, rural chapters, diocesan meetings, with an unanimity never known till then, not only protested against the Supremacy of the Holy See, but *fell for protection at the feet of the Royal Supremacy* (p. 13).

Time passed on and Convocation obtained leave to act. What were its declarations? did it reaffirm Baptismal Regeneration? On the contrary, "for thirteen years the Church of England has met, I know not how often, in Convocation; but on the appellate jurisdiction and the Gorham heresy not an act has been done, not a word has been resolved" (p. 14). So much on one of the two Anglican sacraments. As to the other, all which Archdeacon Denison even claimed (p. 15) was a liberty to hold one of two contradictory doctrines; nor has any Anglican even expressed a desire, that clergymen may be forbidden to hold that tenet, which Tractarians regard as heretical. Next as to another sacrament, though one not recognized as such by Anglicans.

The Christian law of marriage has been abolished by Act of Parliament. For the first time since the coming of S. Augustine of Canterbury, the bond

of marriage is dissoluble in English law ; and divorce, borrowed partly from Judaism, and partly from the schismatics of the East, has been introduced. This has been done by Act of Parliament alone ; yet the Church of England has made no protest, and its clergy are bound to remarry, or to lend the church for the remarriage of, those whose husbands or wives are still living : and they do so (p. 17).

This, however, concerns only *successive* polygamy. But *simultaneous* polygamy "has been allowed by Dr. Colenso, under the protection of Dr. Whately, to the Christians of Natal" (*ib.*).

And now on the top of these various apostasies came the judgment on "Essays and Reviews." Convocation indeed, to do it justice, protested against this book, and ultimately condemned it (p. 37). Nor indeed can we better exhibit to Catholic readers the contents of that miserable volume, than by quoting the summary of its contents from the Convocation document. (See p. 20.)

We find that in many parts of the volume statements and doctrines of the Holy Scriptures are denied, called into question, or disparaged ; for example :—

1. The verity of miracles, including the idea of creation presented to us by the Bible.
2. Predictive prophecy, especially predictions concerning the Incarnation, Person, and Offices of our Lord.
3. The descent of all men from Adam.
4. The fall of man and original sin.
5. The Divine command to sacrifice Isaac.
6. The incarnation of our Lord.
7. Salvation through the blood of Christ.
8. The Personality of the Holy Spirit.
9. Special and supernatural inspiration.

But what power has been permitted to Convocation of *carrying out* this judgment? There is an authority with which alone it rests to assign the conditions, under which an Anglican clergyman may maintain his position as such. That authority is the Crown in Council ; and it has expressly decided "that to deny the inspiration of any portion of the Old and New Testament, so long as no entire Book is thereby erased from the Canon, and to deny the eternity of punishment for the wicked, is not at variance with the Articles or formularies of the Church of England" (p. 22).

Lastly, as a climax comes Dr. Colenso, and denies that Scripture can be trusted even as a substantially true record of facts.

Such was the bearing of our author's first pamphlet. It

was not to be expected that so vigorous and telling an indictment should be left unchallenged; and Anglican rejoinders were numerous and vehement. These rejoinders led to the second treatise in this volume "The Convocation and the Crown in Council" (pp. 35-79). Of this the argument is in some sense supplementary to the former. In the former Mgr. Manning had pointed out how serious were those errors, against which the English clergy had no inclination to protest; and in this he proceeds to show, how unavailing is their protest where they do make one. Convocation, greatly to its honour, condemned the "Essays and Reviews," and declared their teaching "contrary to the doctrine of the Universal Church;" or (in other words) false and heretical. What has been the practical result of this condemnation? Has one single clergyman been prevented thereby from teaching every tenet which they contain? On the contrary (p. 42) the Lord Chancellor declared in the House of Lords that Convocation possesses no such jurisdiction as had been claimed, and "that the whole of it" had "been taken away and annexed to the Crown." As our author points out at length (pp. 42-3) it is not that the Crown extends ever so unduly the sphere of what it calls "temporalities:" no; it has direct jurisdiction over "spiritualities." "The Church of England actually submits, though with much ill will," to this jurisdiction (p. 45).

But what is it which has involved the Church of England in this ignominious subjection? Obviously and undeniably the Reformation. Slavery to the State, so far as the Church of England was concerned, was the one animating principle of that whole movement.

The claim of supremacy and of final determination in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, is a primary principle of the Anglican system. It has been accepted, and even clamorously affirmed, by the Anglican Church. The appellate jurisdiction of the Crown in all causes is the same in principle, whether under the form and title of the Court of Delegates or of the Privy Council. Its machinery may vary, but the thing is identical (p. 46).

This brings Mgr. Manning to consider what were the principles of the English Reformation. They were essentially rationalistic.

Anglicans acknowledge readily that Protestantism is essentially rationalistic, but deny that Anglicanism is Protestant. What I wish to show is, that Anglicanism is identical in principle with all other forms of the Protestant Reformation (p. 50).

Three principles in particular were common to Anglicans with all Protestants. Firstly and fundamentally this; that they rebelled against the direct unintermittent energizing

magisterium of the living Church, and appealed therefrom to private judgment in one or other shape.

It matters not to what they appeal, whether to Scripture, or to Fathers, or to Antiquity, or to the undivided Church, as they say, before the separation of the East and West, or to General Councils in the past or in the future ; for all these are but so many forms and pleas of evasion to cover the essence of their insubordination, which consists in this, namely, the refusal of the living voice of the Church as the rule of faith. For example, if a subject refuse submission to the sovereign power, and appeal to parliaments in the past or princes in the future, nobody would care for the tribunal to which he appealed. To refuse obedience to the sovereign is treason. Such an act would be a capital offence. So it is with the Church. There can be no appeal from its voice without a denial of the law : "He that heareth you heareth me" (p. 51).

Secondly, all alike profess the sufficiency of Scripture ; for this is expressly asserted in the Articles of the Church of England. And thirdly, all alike profess that the Church's teaching had become corrupt, and proclaim, accordingly, a doctrinal reform. "Anglicanism" indeed "is perhaps the most obtrusive" of all "in its claim to a special purity and primitiveness in its system" (p. 51).

The following passage, reprinted from a former work, is among the most striking we have anywhere seen in theological controversy :—

During the eighteen centuries of its existence, the Catholic Church has been tried by the rise of a succession of heresies within its unity. Every century has had its characteristic heresy. From Gnosticism to Jansenism there is a line of almost unbroken succession in error, which has sprung up parasitically by the side of the Divine Truth. But the Church remained steadfast and resplendent, without change or shadow of vicissitude, ever the same, and perfect in its light as in the beginning. The errors of the human intellect have never fastened upon the supernatural intelligence of the mystical body ; but every successive error has been expelled by the vital and vigorous action of the infallible mind and voice of the Church of God. All its dogmas of faith remain to this hour incorrupt, because incorruptible, and therefore, primitive and immutable. The errors of men have been cast forth *as humours which are developed in the human system, but cannot coexist with the principle of life and health.* A living body casts off whatever assails its perfection. . . . But in the Anglican Church all is the reverse. Every error which has sprung up in it, adheres to it still. Its *doctrines vanish, its heresies abide.* All its morbid humours are absorbed into its blood (pp. 63–5).

The next treatise is to our mind the ablest and most important in the volume : it is on "the workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England." It was occasioned by the following singular statement of Dr. Pusey's. "A class of

believers," said that prejudiced controversialist, "joined in the triumph" caused by the Privy Council judgment on "Essays and Reviews ; "

" And while I know that a very earnest body of Roman Catholics rejoice in all the workings of God the Holy Ghost in the Church of England (whatever they think of her), and are saddened in what weakens her who is, in God's hands, the great bulwark against infidelity in this land, others seemed to be in an ecstasy of triumph at this victory of Satan."

Every one thought at the time that Dr. Pusey intended to include Mgr. Manning in the last-named category ; though we have great pleasure in recording, that he has since entirely disavowed any such intention. At all events, Mgr. Manning replies that, on the one hand, he heartily rejoices in all the workings of the Holy Ghost in the Church of England, though, on the other hand, he cannot regard her as "the great bulwark against infidelity in this land."

As to the former portion of this answer, it is astonishing how widely an impression once prevailed among the Anglican party that converts to Catholicism ordinarily regard their past spiritual life as a mockery, and deny the past operations within them of the Holy Ghost. On the other hand, if converts indignantly repudiated so perverse a notion, then they were assailed on the other side, as admitting by this very repudiation that, in some sense or other, the Establishment is part of the Visible Church. The main purport of the truly admirable essay before us is to lay down the true "via media" which lies between these two extremes. There is abundant grace, says the author, ever active and energetic among Anglicans ; but not on that account are they members of the Visible Church. Great numbers of them have, indeed, been baptized in their infancy, and were thus raised to the supernatural order. If these men, after they become adults, remain faithful to actual grace and avoid mortal sin, they retain that habitual grace which they received at Baptism ; but not on that account are they members of the Church's *body*, though they appertain to her *soul*. But, putting aside this question of Baptism, every Catholic holds that supernatural grace visits even the unbaptized ; that they have full power of corresponding with that grace ; that if they do duly correspond with it, they will obtain an increased degree thereof ; and that finally, by an act of sovereign love, they may obtain the great gift of justification. Under any circumstances, it is not for being external to the Visible Church that men are punished (p. 95), but for being *culpably* external to her. But all this, as is evident, has nothing to do with the Church of England,



*as such* ; it applies equally to the whole English people, whether Anglicans or dissenters. Indeed the author has on more than one occasion expressed his own greater sympathy with the piety of the latter as compared with the former class. (See, *e. g.* p. 101.) Nor, again, does it at all follow,—because you have received abundant grace whether in your position as an Anglican or as a dissenter,—that you are therefore permitted by God to remain in Anglicanism or in dissent (p. 103). On the contrary, grace is given to call you into the Church ; and so soon as you have sufficient light, you forfeit your state of justification if you shrink from following that light.

Next as to the office of the Establishment in witnessing truth. It is a teacher of *truths*, says our author, but not of *truth* : for to say the latter “would imply that it teaches the truth in all its circumference and in all its divine certainty” (p. 104).

Still, every Catholic may well grieve—and the Archbishop has ever sincerely grieved—at every successive step whereby those truths which the Church of England teaches have been lessened in number or weakened in emphasis.

Yet at last, how is it possible to suppose, as Dr. Pusey supposes, that the Church of England is the great bulwark against infidelity in this land? (p. 114). For an earnest repudiation of this statement Mgr. Manning here proceeds to give four separate reasons ; on which Dr. Pusey afterwards rejoined in the *Eirenicon*. In our number for January, 1866 (pp. 233-236), will be found both a careful statement of our author’s reasons, and a careful examination of Dr. Pusey’s attempted replies.

Mgr. Manning concludes this essay with some very touching personal remarks. With great humour he refers to the accusation, which was commonly brought against him in his Anglican days, of being “slow to advance ; somewhat tame ; cautious to excess ; morbidly moderate” (p. 123). “But now,” he adds, “is there anything in the extreme opposite of this which I am not in the opinion of many ? Ultramontane, violent, unreasoning, bitter, rejoicing in the miseries of my neighbours, destructive, a very Apollyon, and the like.” Our own solution of this apparent paradox is extremely simple. Whether as an Anglican or a Catholic, our author has simply held the tenets legitimately appertaining to his position. When he was an Anglican, he guided himself by the Prayer-book and Articles ; whereas many of his contemporaries revolted against so odious a yoke, even while not seeing their way to abandon the Establishment. In due time he submitted himself to that Church, which regards the Holy



Father as the divinely-appointed teacher of all Christians. In his new position, as in his old, he has accepted the tenets of his creed in their obvious sense ; and he has had therefore no other aim than to embrace that precise view of religion which the Holy See sets forth. When he was an Anglican, several Anglicans, who did not accept fully the Anglican position, thought him "behindhand and un-Catholic ;" and now that he is a Catholic, those Catholics who do not fully accept the Catholic position think him bitter and violent. The simple truth is, that in each case he has accepted his position and his critics have not accepted theirs.

But I have written, some say, hard things of the Church of England. Are they hard truths or hard epithets ? If they are hard epithets, show them to me, and I will erase them with a prompt and public expression of regret ; but if they be hard facts, I cannot change them. It is true, indeed, that I have for the last fourteen years incessantly and unchangingly, by word and by writing, borne my witness to the truths by which God has delivered me from the bondage of a human authority in matters of faith. I have borne my witness to the presence and voice of a Divine, and therefore infallible Teacher, guiding the Church with His perpetual assistance, and speaking through it as His organ. I have also borne witness that the Church through which He teaches is that which S. Augustine describes by the two incommunicable notes—that it is "spread throughout the world" and "united to the chair of Peter." \* I know that the corollaries of these truths are severe, peremptory, and inevitable. If the Catholic faith be the perfect revelation of Christianity, the Anglican Reformation is a cloud of heresies ; if the Catholic Church be the organ of the Holy Ghost, the Anglican Church is not only no part of the Church, but no Church of divine foundation. It is a human institution, sustained, as it was founded, by a human authority ; without priesthood, without sacraments, without absolution, without the Real Presence of Jesus upon its altars. I know these truths are hard. It seems heartless, cruel, unfilial, unbrotherly, ungrateful, so to speak of all the beautiful fragments of Christianity which mark the face of England, from its thousand towns to its green villages, so dear even to us who believe it to be both in heresy and in schism. You must feel it so. You must turn from me and turn against me for saying it ; but if I believe it, must I not say it ? And if I say it, can I find words more weighed, measured, and deliberate than those I have used ? If you can show them to me, and so that they are adequate, I will use them always hereafter. God knows I have never written a syllable with the intent to leave a wound. *I have erased many, I have refrained from writing and speaking many, lest I should give more pain than duty commanded me to give* (pp. 128, 9).

In the interval which elapsed between the publication of the third and fourth treatises, the author became Archbishop.

---

\* S. Aug. Opp. tom. ii. pp. 119, 120 ; tom. x. p. 93.

During the same interval also appeared Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon. Accordingly, the fourth treatise on "Reunion of Christendom" on the one hand has in some sense an official character, having been written as a pastoral address to the clergy of the Westminster diocese; while on the other hand it contains several allusions to the Eirenicon, though without expressly mentioning that work. Its occasion was the publishing of a document sent to the English bishops by the Holy Office, in regard to the notorious A. P. U. C. It is difficult adequately to estimate the benefit conferred on the Church by this pastoral of the Archbishop's. The very sound of union and unity is sweet to a Catholic ear; and Dr. Pusey has recently, since the publication of his Eirenicon, been speaking far more amiably of the Catholic Church than he does in that offensive volume. There was very serious danger then lest vital truth should be compromised, through desire of a spurious and factitious union. The bishops, as might have been expected, did not withhold a warning voice; and the Bishop of Birmingham in particular deserves the special gratitude of every Catholic, for his unwearying exertions in the good cause. But no one came more prominently forward—as indeed became his office—than the Archbishop.

He pointed out (p. 211) that Unionism is but Latitudinarianism and Indifferentism in another dress. Protestantism, he explained, is private judgment exercised on Scripture; Anglicanism is private judgment exercised on Scripture and Antiquity; Unionism is private judgment exercised on ecclesiastical definitions. Any one of the three, just as much as any other, is rebellion against the Church's living voice, and against the principle of intellectual captivity. Submission to an ever-living and energizing authority—this is the badge of a Catholic; revolt against such submission—this is the sure token of an alien in spirit. We will quote one or two very striking passages, in which the Archbishop illustrates this argument.

It would be contrary to charity to put a straw across the path of those who profess to desire union. But *there is something more divine than union; that is, the Faith.* . . . The Church is definite, precise, and peremptory in its declarations of doctrine. It refuses all compromise, transaction or confusion of the terms and limits of its definitions. It is intolerant not only of contradiction, but of deviation. It excludes every formula but its own. The world is moving in the reverse direction. It is throwing everything open, levelling boundaries, taking in all forms of opinion, comprehending all sects of Christians, by eliminating their differences, and finding a higher generality, a *summum genus* which embraces all. The Humanita-

rians merge all religion in Naturalism ; the Unitarians in Christian morality ; the Latitudinarians in the residuum of Christianity, which survives the elimination of differences among Protestants ; the Anglicans in an imaginary faith of the undivided Church ; the Unionists in an agreement of the universal Church, which shall neither be the Thirty-nine Articles, as they are understood by Englishmen, nor the *Council of Trent*, as understood by Catholics, but the text of both, understood in a sense known neither to the Church of England nor to the Church of Rome—a doctrine wider than either, compared with which the faith and theology of the Church is denounced as narrow and sectarian (pp. 155, 6).

There is no unity possible except by the way of truth. *Truth first, unity afterwards ; truth the cause, unity the effect.* To invert this order is to overthrow the Divine procedure. The unity of Babel ended in confusion ; the union of Pentecost fused all nations in one body by the one dogma of faith. *To unite the Anglican, the Greek, and the Catholic Church in any conceivable way could only end in a Babel of tongues, intellects, and wills.* The intrinsic repulsions of the three are irresistible. *Union is not unity.* Heterogeneous and repugnant things may be arbitrarily tied together, but this is not unity. Union has in itself no assimilating power. Closer contact elicits the repugnances which rend all external bonds asunder. Truth alone generates unity. *It was the dogma of faith which united the intellects of men as one intelligence. The unity of truth generated its universality.* The faith is Catholic, not only because it is spread throughout the world, but because throughout the world it is one and the same. The unity of the faith signifies that it is the same in every place. If it were not the same, it would not be universal. Identity is the condition both of unity and of universality. From this springs the supernatural harmony of the human intelligence, spreading throughout the Church, and reaching throughout all its ages. The dogma of faith has made it one by the assimilating power of the one science of God. From this unity of intellects has sprung the unity of wills. *The unity of the Church is created by the submission of all wills to one Divine Teacher through the pastors of the Church, especially the one who is supreme on earth.* Submission to one authority by an inevitable consequence draws after it unity of communion (pp. 160, 161).

It is indeed true, that the highest authority on earth has been compelled to check all hope of reunion between the Anglican and the Catholic Church, founded on mutual concessions, *reciprocal interpretations*, much more, on compromises or concordats. To do so, would be to *bind up a broken limb without setting it*, or to tie a graft against the bark of a tree, instead of inserting it into the symmetry and the sap of its vital structure. For the sake of truth, and for the salvation of souls, and in obedience to the divine authority of the Church, and in conformity to the light of the Spirit of Truth Who guides its judgments, we are compelled to decline all overtures as of contracting parties. The Commission of the Church is to “make disciples of all nations.” *A disciple recognises and submits to his teacher. The disciple who argues with his teacher is a judge, not a learner.* To treat with the Church of God is to deny its divine authority ; but its divine authority is a primary article of revelation, and runs through every other article of faith. If a man

believe the whole faith, and yet offend in this one point, he is incapable of admission to the unity of the Church (pp. x. xi).

This last quotation brings us to the Archbishop's introductory essay. He has given it no name; but it might be called with sufficient accuracy "the History of Religion in England since the Reformation, with Consideration of its Present Condition and Prospects." Its general argument may be briefly stated as follows. We begin with the author's very words.

The three theological *loci*, Tradition, Scripture, and Reason, are to be found nowhere in full application and in full harmony except under the supreme guidance of the living mind and living voice of the Catholic Church. They co-exist in it at this hour, as every student of S. Thomas knows, in every article of his *Summa*. They co-existed in England before the schism of the sixteenth century. But when the divine bond of unity and authority was broken, they parted asunder into three conflicting tendencies of thought, the sources of perpetual controversy. And these three methods of religious thought mark the three progressive phases of decline from faith to unbelief, through which the intelligence of England is passing (pp. xvii. xviii.).

Of these three *loci*, proceeds the Archbishop, Tradition has been represented among English Protestants by the High Churchmen; Scripture by the Evangelicals; and Reason by the Latitudinarians and Rationalists. These three schools have co-existed in the Establishment from the first; but with varying mutual relations. Down to the Puritan movement, under Charles I., the High Church party was constantly increasing in power; much of Catholic Tradition remained in the body of the people; and there was a degree of approximation to Catholicism, which even in these Ritualistic days it is difficult to imagine. Then came in with violence the Puritan flood; and "after the twelve years of the Commonwealth the Anglican Church was raised again, like a ship which had been for a time under water. All but its lines were washed away" (p. xx.).

In this state of things came the collision with Catholicism under James II. Thanks to that monarch's unwise and unscrupulous conduct—against which the Holy See was ever protesting—the whole nation became far more profoundly imbued even than before, both with hatred and with dread of the Catholic Church; and from that time the rationalistic party remained for many years in the ascendant. The reasonableness of revealed doctrine—the argumentative evidence for the truth of Revelation—these two theses were the sum and substance of speculative theology, with the great mass of Churchmen; while a moral depravity prevailed which seems

to have been almost unexampled (p. xxvii.). It is evident at once, then, that "the second collision of England with the Catholic Church, in 1688, produced a far more violent recoil, and a far wider departure from the Faith than the first in 1562." The Archbishop mentions this "for the purpose of showing that the tendencies of faith and unbelief at this time give reason to fear that another collision may come hereafter, of which the result would be a still greater recoil from faith, and a wider departure from Christianity" (p. xxix.).

This downward progress lasted till about the year 1750. But "from that time until now there has been a gradual and steady re-ascending towards Christian faith. Men returned to the belief that Christianity is reasonable; then, that it is true; then, that the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation are Christian doctrines; then, to belief in the operations of grace, of the Redemption by atonement and sacrifice; then, of the institution, grace, and obligation of Sacraments" (pp. xxx. xxxi.). Moreover, this salutary reaction proceeded during at least a period of one hundred years, up to 1850. By this time the Catholic Church was far more prominent in England, than it had been at any previous period since the Reformation. And now the hierarchy was restored; and the Church "began to act as a body by its corporate presence and influence upon public opinion, and upon every class of the English people." She is "at this hour in contact with the intelligence and the consciousness of the people of England as she has never been since the last Requiem was sung in Westminster Abbey" (pp. xxxv. xxxvi.).

But in company with these two bright features of our time—the unprecedented prominence of Catholicism, and the greatly-improved character of English piety in general,—there is a third feature, gloomy in the present, and very far more gloomy in our anticipations of the future. There has arisen a vastly more fundamental and subversive rationalism than was ever to be found before. But every sign alike—whether good or evil—points to two inevitable consummations: (1) The union of all good men under the shadow of S. Peter, and in communion with the Catholic Church; and (2) a violent and internecine conflict, between the Church on the one hand and the combined forces of rationalism and impiety on the other. Our one hope of success in this conflict depends, under God, on the unswerving faithfulness of individuals to every true Catholic principle. There can be no greater madness—there can be in effect (however unintentionally) no more ruinous treachery—than the giving up one

particle of full Catholic belief, one single doctrine which the Church really teaches, in the interest of compromise and spurious liberality.

This is the great lesson which Archbishop Manning has consistently taught. Among the various champions of the Church in England who have come forth at this critical period of her history, he will ever have a place in Catholic memory peculiar to himself. His mind is singularly well balanced, and he unites characteristics apparently opposite in a truly surprising harmony. No one exceeds him in his love for England; yet that love is ever held in most absolute subordination to his reverence for Rome. He yearns with a passionate desire for the reunion of Christendom; but that desire has never led him for one moment to veil so much as one of the Church's characteristic doctrines, or concede one jot or tittle to the shallow liberalism of the day.

---

#### ART. VI.—S. JANE FRANCES DE CHANTAL.

*Histoire de Sainte Chantal, et des Origines de la Visitation.* Par M. l'Abbé EM. BOUGAUD, Vicaire-Général d'Orléans. Troisième édition. Paris : Librairie Ve. Poussielgue et Fils, Rue Cassette 27. 1865.

IN a letter from the Bishop of Orleans, prefixed by the Abbé Bougaud to his life of S. Jane Frances de Chantal, the following qualifications are laid down as essential to the successful accomplishment of the biography of a saint:—First, and chiefly, a real and hearty love, with a true conception and full appreciation of his character; secondly, an attentive study of his interior and exterior life, implying a laborious and mature examination of contemporary documents; thirdly, a life-like portrait of the saint, with its characteristic features, both in the order of nature and of grace, and a skilful and artistic grouping of historical facts and persons, so that the central figure may neither stand alone, with nothing to mark his age, position, or relations with his fellow-men, nor be buried under a mass of antiquarian and archæological details. We believe that the readers of M. Bougaud's work will agree with the opinion of Mgr. Doupanloup, that it admirably combines all these requisites. He had lived from his childhood at Dijon, the native city of Jeanne Françoise Frémyot. Love and reverence for her who may be accounted its patroness were the



habitual feelings of his boyhood, and strengthened with the development of his spiritual life as a man and a priest. The thought of writing her life first arose from his becoming accidentally acquainted with some precious manuscripts written during her lifetime, which were preserved in the convent of the Visitation at Dijon. He was at once struck and fascinated by the character of the saint, which, from various causes, had never been adequately set forth in any of her published memoirs; and he set himself, as a labour of love, to trace her through all the scenes of her varied history. He visited Bourbilly, which witnessed her bright and brief period of earthly happiness; the château of Monthélon, where the early years of her widowhood, uncheered by any human consolation, were spent in a continual heroic exercise of patience, humility, and tender charity to the poor; and, lastly, the little town of Annecy, in Savoy, the first home of her religious life, and the cradle of the Order of the Visitation. There he was allowed to examine the invaluable collection of manuscripts treasured in the archives of the convent.

I perused successively (he says) the magnificent collection of the autograph letters of S. Francis of Sales and S. Chantal; the first full of erasures and corrections, the second written with a firmer hand, but in a most strange orthography. A great number of these are still unpublished, and the rest have been most unfaithfully edited.

He saw the autograph manuscript of the memoirs of the Mère de Chaugy, written in a large, bold hand, without a correction, and more than twenty volumes, still in manuscript, and unknown beyond the cloisters of the Visitation, containing the histories of the principal foundations of the Order in all parts of the world. More than all, the six folio volumes were placed in his hands, containing the process of the canonization of S. Jane Frances, stamped with the highest degree of certainty and authenticity by the seals of the Notaries Apostolic. These seals had been placed upon the volumes after all the depositions had been collected, pain of excommunication being pronounced against any who should open them before the publication of the Bull of Canonization. That publication was delayed until the year 1767, and the convent of Annecy having been destroyed in the French Revolution, these volumes remained unknown and forgotten in the archives of the See, until Mgr. Rendu determined to break the seals, just before M. Bougaud's pilgrimage to Annecy. He is therefore the first historian of S. Jane Frances who ever saw these precious and still unpublished pages. He also saw the ancient Chapter-book, begun two centuries ago and

not yet finished, the first pages of which were written by S. Francis of Sales, and where the history of the foundation of the convent of Annecy is written by the hand of S. Chantal herself, whose signature is also attached to the minutes of the chapters over which she presided. S. Francis of Sales having written on the first page of this book the prayer that the names inscribed on these perishable leaves may be for ever written in the Book of Life, not only had the religious ever accounted it a great honour to have their names written there, but kings, queens, cardinals, bishops, and nobles of all countries have for more than two centuries eagerly sought permission to sign their names beneath those of the two saints.

The distinguishing feature in the character of S. Jane Frances was *fortitude*. "I have found," said S. Francis of Sales, after his first interview with her, "*Mulierem fortem, la femme forte* at Dijon;" and the Church commemorates this especial gift in the Collect for her feast:—

*Omnipotens et misericors Deus, qui beatam Joannam Franciscam tuo amore succensam admirabile spiritus fortitudine per omnes vitæ semitas in via perfectiones donasti.*

She was to be, says the Abbé Bougaud, in a century shadowed by great apostacies and shameful falls, a glorious revelation of the spirit of fortitude. What age of the Church, he adds, had ever greater deed of such a manifestation than our own? When had faint hearts and low aims more urgent need of the invigorating power of great example?

The early training of the saint tended in no slight degree to foster her natural strength of character.

She had no memory of her mother, who died when she was only eighteen months old, leaving behind her a character for piety and charity befitting one in whose veins ran, we are told, "some drops of the blood of S. Bernard." The portrait of the noble-minded father who watched over her infancy is thus sketched by Abbé Bougaud:—

The President Frémyot possessed, in fact, in a high degree all the qualities necessary for that difficult office. God, who destined our saint to do such great things for Him, seems to have deprived her of a mother's caresses in order to give her the training of a man. He entrusted her infancy to one able to train her to that life of faith, generosity, and self-sacrifice of which she was to set so glorious an example of the seventeenth century. The President Frémyot was distinguished among his compeers of the Parliament for his strong sense, the rectitude of his judgments, and the promptness and energy of his will. Better still, he was remarkable for the purity of his faith, his ardent devotion to the Church, and his inflexibility of conscience. He was one of those men with whom the sense of duty was the ruling power, who cannot conceive the possibility of a moment's hesitation in obeying it,

though at the cost of a thousand lives, and who only want an occasion to call them forth to be recognised as heroes. These occasions were not wanting in the troubled life of the President, and more than once we see him rise to heroism, so simply and so naturally as to be unconscious of it himself.

M. Frémyot had joined the League in the days when it embodied one of the purest acts of faith ever elicited from a Christian nation. Its object was to preserve the Catholic Kingdom of France from the dangers apprehended from a Protestant heir presumptive. It had been blessed by Pope Gregory XIII., headed by King Henry III., encouraged by the clergy, enthusiastically hailed by the nation at large. But the passions and the weaknesses of men soon lowered and sullied a cause once so holy, and the sword which had been drawn to preserve the throne from a Protestant successor was turned against the Catholic king. The crimes of Henry III. formed no justification, in the eyes of the President Frémyot, of what he accounted an act of rebellion. He withdrew therefore from the parliament of Burgundy, which adhered almost unanimously to the League, and retired to the country; thus separating himself from the first President Bruslard, and others of his kindred and friends who headed the movement. Without a moment's hesitation he gathered together those magistrates who still preserved their allegiance to the last of the house of Valois, and declared in the name of Henry III. that the parliament of Burgundy is transferred from Dijon to Flavigny. In their indignation the Leaguers confiscated all the property of their opponents, and having in vain endeavoured to win over M. Frémyot, whom they knew to be the soul of the king's party, they had recourse to the savage expedient of sending him word that unless the royalist parliament were immediately dissolved, they would send him the head of his son, who had fallen into their hands. "Better," replied the Christian hero, "that the child should die innocent, than that the father should live guilty." And he wrote a letter of remonstrance, the pathos and the eloquence of which shamed the most furious of his adversaries out of their evil purpose. They contented themselves with keeping the boy in prison, and holding the sword suspended over his head, in the hope that the long trial might at last sap the fidelity which they had failed to carry by storm.

In the meantime, says M. Bougaud, terrible tidings resounded from one end of France to the other. Henry III. had been assassinated, 2nd of August, 1589. The ancient race of Valois was extinct, the throne of S. Louis belonged to a Protestant.

Catholic France was struck to the heart by the news. Instead of the acclamations, and the *Vive le Roi* wont to hail the accession of a new sovereign, men were seen drawing their hats over their brow, or grasping each other's hands, and swearing rather to die a thousand deaths than acknowledge a Huguenot king.

So keen was the anguish of the President Frémyot, that his hair turned white in a single night. What was to be done? Henry IV. was the descendant of S. Louis, the lawful heir to the crown: how could he be excluded? On the other hand, Henry IV. was a heretic: how could he be obeyed?

M. Frémyot spent a whole night in the agony of such questions: he came forth with his head white from agitation and sleeplessness, but with his resolution made. Henry IV. was the heir of S. Louis, the throne was his right, M. Frémyot unfurled his standard on the towers of Flavigny. On the other hand, Henry IV. was a Protestant, he could not reign over France. M. Frémyot resolved rather to die at the gates of Flavigny than permit the king to enter until he had made his abjuration.

"Sire," said he afterwards to the great Henry, "I confess that if your Majesty had not cried, *Vive l'Eglise Romaine*, I should never have cried, *Vive le Roi Henri IV.*"

As M. Frémyot was drawing up the oath of allegiance to be taken by the army, a musket-ball broke the drum upon which he was writing. His hand did not even tremble: he simply asked for another drum, and went on writing on the same spot.

When Henry IV., after his submission to the Catholic Church, made his triumphal entry into Dijon, he received with distinguished honour the magistrates who had served him so faithfully. "Monsieur," said he to the President Frémyot, "you have so well filled the place of first President of Flavigny, that I would have you to be first President here also." "God forbid, Sire," replied M. Frémyot, "that I should intrude myself into the place of a living man: the first President is a good Catholic, he will serve your Majesty well."

On the following day, one of the magistrates of Dijon was brought before Henry IV., on a charge of treason; it was the very man who had seized the President's son and threatened the unhappy father to send him his head in a sack. M. Frémyot pleaded so earnestly for his pardon that Henry's generous heart was moved. "President," said he, "I see that my clemency must keep pace with yours; you ask the life of your enemy, and I must grant it to you."

M. Frémyot's one desire in the midst of the honours and prosperity which had succeeded so many and such sharp trials was to forsake the world and to serve God in the ecclesiastical

state. It was his only ambition, but it was not the will of God that it should be gratified. The vocation to the priesthood which was denied to himself was vouchsafed to the son, whose life he had so freely offered to God, and who was afterwards Archbishop of Bourges, and tenderly beloved both by his holy sister and S. Francis of Sales.

Such was the father of *la femme forte*, and from the few details which we have of her childhood it would seem that it was passed in a familiar intercourse with him, not usual between parents and children in those stately times. At five years old she was playing in her father's room, when a discussion arose between him and a Protestant visitor on the subject of the Real Presence.

When the child heard that holy truth denied, she came close to the Protestant. "Monseigneur," she said, with flashing eyes, "you must believe that Jesus Christ is in the Blessed Sacrament, because He says He is; and if you don't believe Him, you make Him a liar." The Protestant gentleman tried to propitiate her with sugar-plums. She took them in her apron, and walked straight with them to the fire, saying, "Monseigneur, that is the way heretics will burn in hell, because they will not believe what our Lord says." And on another occasion she said to the same gentleman, "Monseigneur, if you had given the lie to the king, my father would have had you hanged; well," pointing to a large picture of S. Peter and S. Paul, "you have given the lie over and over again to our Lord, and so those two presidents there will have you hanged."

The education of Jeanne Françoise was carefully attended to. "She learned," says the Mère de Chaugy, "with great quickness and ability all those things which befitted a young lady of her condition." Her religious instruction was given by her pious father himself, who called his three children round him daily, in the morning and in the evening, and impressed upon them those lessons of Christian faith and practice, and devoted allegiance to Holy Church, which shone forth so brightly in his own example. Jane Frances was remarked, even in those early days, for her tender compassion to the poor, and her filial devotion to the Blessed Virgin, to whom she clung with the special affection often elicited from the heart of motherless children by the *Mother of fair love*.

We read in the memoirs of the Mère de Chaugy, the following touching narrative of the death of M. Jean Frémyot, the Saint's grandfather, which occurred during her childhood. At the age of upwards of seventy-five, having been long one of the lights of the Parliament of Burgundy, in the full possession

of all his faculties of mind and body, he retired from the world, to employ the remainder of his green and beautiful old age in preparation for eternity.

Now one morning M. Jean Frémyot called his children and grandchildren together, and although he was in his wonted health, he told them that God had revealed to him the hour of his death, and that he should die on the morrow. Then he mounted his mule, and went to bid farewell to his friends and relations, telling them with holy simplicity that he was about to set forth on his eternal journey. On his return he arranged that a priest should be ready to say mass the next morning in a little chapel, from which he could hear it in his bed, and said plainly that his soul would depart before the priest had received the last ablution. He spent the night very devoutly, though in great suffering ; and when the morning dawned he made his confession, communicated, received extreme unction, and begged that the mass might be begun, adding, "Inasmuch as before the last ablution I am to go to drink of the eternal nectar in the kingdom of my God." He heard this mass with wonderful devotion, and at the moment when the priest raised the chalice, the holy old man lifted his eyes with an angelic expression towards the eternal mountains, saying, *Quando consolaberis me?* And with those words on his lips he expired.

The memory of this blessed death was one of the last which Jane Frances carried with her from her father's house to the home of her elder sister Margaret, who in 1589 made a brilliant marriage with M. de Neufchêzes, Seigneur des Francs, one of the first noblemen in Poitou. The President Frémyot seized the opportunity to send his younger daughter, now sixteen, from the dangers of the approaching civil war, to a part of the country which, though desolated and wasted by the outrages of the Huguenots, was at that time free from disturbance. To the last day of her life our Saint preserved a mournful remembrance of the desolation which she had witnessed in Poitou. The Huguenots, who had long been masters of the country, had left nothing but ruins behind them. Almost all the churches had been destroyed or desecrated, the steeples shattered by cannon-balls, statues mutilated, reliquaries melted down, and their precious contents scattered to the winds. Even in her old age her eyes would fill with tears when she heard the lamentations chanted in Holy Week, at the remembrance of the desolation which, in her girlhood, she had seen in Poitou. In the house of her brother-in-law, Jane Frances was exposed to dangers from which her father's watchful care would doubtless have shielded her at home. A worldly and wicked old woman was associated with her, as her *dame de compagnie*. From her evil suggestions and light discourse, the innocent girl sought refuge at the altar of Mary,



and in lonely meditation on the holy home of Nazareth. To the loving care of her heavenly Mother she ever attributed her deliverance from this and from other insidious snares which the enemy of souls laid for her on the eve of womanhood. She was sought in marriage by an intimate friend of M. de Neufchêzes, a man of high rank, graceful exterior, and apparently unshaken loyalty to the Catholic faith. To the astonishment of her friends, who had no suspicion of his concealed heresy, and to the confusion of him whose hypocrisy was thus unmasked, the young maiden replied, "I would choose a perpetual prison rather than the house of a Huguenot for my house, and a thousand deaths, one after the other, rather than bind myself in marriage to an enemy of the Church." Jane Frances had no sooner attained her twentieth year than she was summoned home by her father, to bestow her hand on a worthier object. The young Baron de Chantal, now in his twenty-eighth year, was the heir of the illustrious family of Rabutin, and the last descendant in the female line of the house of S. Bernard. His father, an old soldier of the League, had fought side by side with the President Frémyot at Semur and Flavigny. The son had inherited his father's valour with a gentleness very foreign to the nature of the old Baron.

This gentleness (according to the family chronicle of Bussy Rabutin) caused many of those bullies who think a man cannot be brave without being a boaster, to fasten quarrels upon him, but he undeceived them at the point of the sword.

Before he was twenty he had fought eighteen successful duels, happily without bringing the guilt of blood upon his soul, when he found a worthier cause for his sword in the wars of the League. In spite of his propensity to duels, which seems to have been one of the crying evils of the age, and which in the person of her son afterwards brought so many hours of sorrow and anxiety upon our Saint, he possessed, we are told, fervent faith. He cultivated literature, wrote verses, and excelled in the art of conversation, then at so brilliant a height in France; thus combining the faith and valour of a knight of the middle ages with the cultivation of a gentleman of the seventeenth century. The President Frémyot had intrusted to his sword the city of Semur, whither the sittings of the parliament had been just removed, and he now committed to him the still more precious charge of his beloved child. Jane Frances, according to the memoirs of the Mère de Chaugy, in her twentieth year, was distinguished by great personal beauty, and still more for the

grace and dignity of her bearing ; she was bright and lively, with great clearness and promptness of understanding and solidity of judgment. At Dijon she was called *la dame parfaite*, and great regret was felt by all who knew her when she left the home of her childhood for her husband's feudal castle of Bourbilly. M. Bougaud gives a graphic and very interesting description of the married life of the young Chatelaine. The practical genius and talent for organization which was one day to be so gloriously employed in the service of the Church, were now exercised in the humblest details of domestic life ; and the gift of government, hereafter to be applied to the regulation of a religious order, was now brought to bear upon the household and the tenantry of Bourbilly.

With the exception of the loss of two children in their cradle, the eight years of our Saint's married life were shadowed by one only cloud, the frequent absences of her husband, rendered necessary by his attendance on the king. At these times she felt drawn to a life of closer union with God than she had yet attained, or than her passionate attachment to her husband rendered possible in his presence. When M. de Chantal was at Court, says Bussy Rabutin, "She gave herself wholly to God ; when he came home, she gave herself wholly to him." And she says herself of this period of her life, "When M. de Chantal was away from me, I felt myself drawn wholly to God, but alas !" she adds, "I knew not how to turn the grace of God to account ; for I directed almost all my thoughts and prayers to the preservation and return of my dear husband." At the age of five-and-thirty, M. de Chantal suddenly left the Court, which was about to make him a marshal of France, rather than execute a command which he accounted unjust. It was immediately after her husband's return, as she fondly believed to a life to be spent uninterruptedly with her, that a dreadful famine which ravaged Burgundy, gave occasion to the first miracle recorded of the Saint. Not content with the abundant alms daily distributed at the castle-gate, she turned the castle itself into a hospital, preparing with her husband's consent a number of beds for the sick, and especially for the poor mothers who, wasted with famine, were unable to nourish their infants. An immense oven, called the oven of the poor, was long shown as a memorial of those days of munificent charity. It contained thirty bushels, and although it was heated four times a day, it often failed to supply the bread required for the poor. Some of her household began to murmur at the lavish bounty of their mistress, and at last brought her word that the provisions in the castle were all but exhausted. She went into the granary, and found only a

single barrel of meal and a little rye. It was mid-winter, and the wants of the poor became more clamorous every day. Madame de Chantal raised her eyes to Heaven, and, full of holy confidence in God, she ordered her servants to take out the meal in handfuls, and to distribute it without measurement to the poor. This went on for six months. Nor was the barrel of meal emptied until the produce of the next harvest was laid up in the granary. The ingenious humility of the Saint always attributed this miracle to the faith and devotion of one of her servants. Shortly after this signal token of the divine favour towards her, Madame de Chantal was visited by the stroke which shattered her earthly happiness. The tranquil resignation of the husband snatched from her by the chance shot of a friend and kinsman, "a lot in cloudless sunshine cast," contrasts strongly with the convulsive agony with which the bereaved wife clung to the hope of his recovery. "Ma Mie," said the dying man, as she met him on the threshold of the castle, "God's decree is just; we must love it and die."—"No, no," replied she, "we must seek a cure." And while M. de Chantal was making his confession, she went from one to another of the physicians, who had come in all haste to the spot, as if to read her fate in their eyes; and as if nothing could resist her love, "Gentlemen," she said, "you *must* cure M. de Chantal."—"Unless it pleases the Heavenly Physician," replied the sick man, "they will be able to do nothing." His agony lasted for nine days. Vainly did he endeavour to persuade the broken-hearted wife to accept the lot before her; it seemed as if her prayers could take no form but this: "O Lord! take everything that I have in the world, but leave me my husband."

God (says M. Bougaud), whose adorable designs will be revealed in the course of this history, had decreed that these prayers should not be granted. He had given M. de Chantal a presentiment of his approaching end. Thus when the physicians were still full of hope, he insisted on settling all his affairs, and desired to receive the last Sacraments. On the day preceding his death, he received the holy Viaticum with the fervour of a religious, for the last time declared his forgiveness of him who had been the cause of his death, and directed that this forgiveness should be inscribed in the parish register, that his children and grandchildren might bear it continually in mind. He also inserted a special clause in his will, disinheriting any one of his children who should attempt to revenge his death. After which, free from all disquietude, his heart being detached from earth, and already full of the heaven which awaited him, he slept the sleep of the just.

During the two first years of the Saint's widowhood, the desolation of heart which threatened to undermine her health,

was frequently cheered by heavenly consolations, more vivid and intense than any she had ever before enjoyed. Her life was wholly given to prayer, the care of her four little children, and the service of the poor. To the sufferings of the heart and affections, were added tortures of the mind and conscience inflicted by an unskilful director.

At the end of the second year, Madame de Chantal received a summons from her husband's father, to bring her children to reside with him at Monthélon. The old Baron de Chantal was an instrument well fitted to complete the stern training which was to prepare the inflexible will of *la femme forte* and the somewhat stately head of "*la dame parfaite*," to bow beneath the light and sweet yoke of S. Francis of Sales.

The family motto still visible over the gateway of the château de Monthélon, "*Virtus vulnere virescit*," well describes the life led there by our Saint, who with her four children entered its gloomy, moated precincts towards the close of the year 1602.

This old Baron de Chantal, who was to be such a torment to our Saint, was not, however, without his good points; he was frank, disinterested, and brave, but his vanity, which was an hereditary weakness in the house of Rabutin, amounted almost to insanity, and was equalled by his violence of temper, which kept him in a continual turmoil of quarrels, lawsuits, and duels, to the disquiet and terror of the neighbourhood. He had already twice incurred sentence of death for homicide, and had only escaped by the opportunity given him by the wars of the League to expiate his offence. Age had in no degree softened his temper, though it had so far weakened his mind as to render the haughty and violent old man the slave of an insolent servant, who established herself and her five children in the castle, and now treated the widow of her master's son with such insolence that she dared not give a glass of wine to a messenger without her permission. This state of humiliating subjection was a severe trial to one whose spirit was naturally proud, and who had been so fondly cherished and so universally honoured throughout the course of her past life. Her heart often swelled within her to see the children of this woman preferred before her own, but she stifled every rebellious feeling of nature, and set herself as the one work of her life to win the souls of her ungracious companions by the sheer force of patience and meekness.

Seven years passed under this iron yoke brought her to her first meeting with S. Francis of Sales, of whom M. Bougaud gives us a beautiful and finished portrait; which is, after all, but the filling up of those few words of S. Vincent of Paul,—

*“ Oh, que Dieu doit être bon, puisque Monsieur de Genève est si bon ! ”* He thus contrasts the characters of the Saint, and his fervent penitent :—

These two holy souls were manifestly not of the same family. We should say that S. Francis of Sales belongs to the tender and loving kindred of S. John, S. Ambrose, S. Francis of Assisi, S. Bonaventure, and Fenelon. S. Chantal, on the contrary, is of the strong and ardent family of S. Paul, S. Dominic, S. Ignatius, S. Teresa, and Bossuet. Their diversity of nature and character is manifest even in their style. That of S. Francis of Sales is flowery, abundant ; it rejoices in images, emblems, and comparisons ; it plays amid flowers. S. Chantal, on the contrary, writes in a firm, condensed unornamented style, but with an ardour, force, and masculine energy most unusual in a woman. Here, however, the difference ceases ; everything else is in harmony. We find in both the same elevation of mind, the same sublimity of thought, the same greatness of soul, the same intense love of God, the same horror of evil, the same contempt of earth, the same aspirations after heaven. But what is most remarkable, notwithstanding an apparent difference, the supernatural path of both was the same. S. Francis of Sales had sanctified himself by adding strength to his sweetness ; S. Chantal was to sanctify herself by adding sweetness to her strength ; and both, after the conclusion of that interior work, were to labour to found for the service of the Church an institute of which the distinctive character was to be, sweetness in strength, and strength in sweetness.

The history of the first meeting of the two Saints, who, living two hundred leagues apart, had been made known to each other in vision, and of the wise and gentle guidance with which, having rescued her from the bondage of her old director, S. Francis led Madame de Chantal to the threshold of her religious life, is well known to all who are acquainted with his life and correspondence ; but it comes before us almost with the charm of novelty in the pages of M. Bougaud, which increase in interest as they bring us to the foundation of the Visitation, the noviciate of S. Jane Frances, and her three first companions, and their training at Annecy, under the personal direction of the holy founder.

No sooner had the infant congregation crossed the Alps to make its second foundation in the city of Lyons, than the happy tranquillity of its early days was ruffled by contention and contradiction. Monseigneur de Marquemont, the Cardinal Archbishop of Lyons, seems to have been one of those good men who would fetter by rule and precedent the free and forward step of the Bride of Christ, as she moves on her predestined way ; and, to use the words of our present Archbishop, “ would bind the hands that were pierced by the bands of their theology.” A community of religious women, without enclosure or solemn vows, was a novelty to him,

though, as is shown by Cardinal Bellarmine, who was consulted by S. Francis on the subject, it was no novelty in the history of the Church.

I will give you (he says) the advice which I would take myself in your case. I would leave these daughters and these widows as they are, and I would make no change in what has been well done. Before Boniface VIII. there were religious women both in the East and in the West, as we know by the testimony of the Holy Fathers, of S. Cyprian, S. Ambrose, S. Jerome, and S. Augustine among the Latins ; S. Athanasius, S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, and many others among the Greeks. Now these religious were not so strictly enclosed within their monasteries that they could not leave them when necessary. And your most reverend lordship is well aware that simple vows are of no less merit or lower obligation before God than solemn vows, since both the solemnity and the enclosure date from the ecclesiastical decree of the same Pope. Therefore, if in your country these daughters and widows can lead lives as holy and as useful to persons in the world by their charity and their good example without being cloistered, I see not why that manner of life should be changed. Nevertheless (he adds with the self-distrust of deep learning and high sanctity), if any one has better advice to give you I willingly retract mine.

S. Jane Frances held to the original design with the firmness which belonged to her.

My very dear Father,—so runs a very characteristic note addressed by her to the Saint on this subject—they have just now come to tell me that a man is setting off for Lyons to-morrow. I beseech you write, if you can, a few words to Monseigneur, and *in good ink*, for it seems to me that this matter is of such great importance to this house that it ought to be pressed. My dearest Father will say that I am always eager. Oh ! assuredly I should be so now with my whole heart, if I could do anything in the matter.

No one saw the force of Bellarmine's opinion more clearly than S. Francis of Sales. Society had evidently come to one of those periods of transformation, when the abundant effusion of the ancient spirit was needed under new forms. He had found one of those forms which was both old and new, and at the same time so marvellously appropriate to the necessities of the age that, notwithstanding the obstinate resistance of the Archbishop of Lyons, it failed not to reappear. Thus, notwithstanding all his sweetness, he did not yield without reluctance. Recognizing the will of God in the opposition raised against his designs, he closed his correspondence with the Archbishop with these words :—

Beholding therein the Providence of God, I repress my desires, and silently acquiesce in your judgment and in your counsel.



By this acquiescence, S. Francis relinquished one of the two leading ideas of his Institute. It had been founded for the reception of such fervent souls as were hindered by weakness of health, age, or other impediments from entering any of the religious houses then existing. With this view the Sisters of the Visitation of S. Mary were dispensed from the practice of the corporal austerities usually required of religious, and from the recital of the great Office of the Church, which was replaced by the little Office of the Blessed Virgin. For the exterior penance was substituted a minuteness and perfection in the practice of obedience, involving a degree of interior mortification which, as we have heard from religious of austere orders, makes the rule of the Visitation a severer restraint on the will than that of any other institute in the Church. It doubtless was a severer curb upon the spirit of S. Jane Frances herself than she would have found in the rule of Mount Carmel, which had just been brought into France by S. Teresa's most illustrious daughter, Ann of Jesus, and to which she had been at first strongly attracted.

The feature in his original design which the humility of S. Francis sacrificed to the scruples of the Archbishop of Lyons was the employment of the sisters in the visitation of the poor and the sick, and their consequent exemption from enclosure. The effectual carrying out of this design might eventually have proved to be beyond the physical powers of those subjects for whom the Institute was principally intended. Be this as it may, it is manifest that although the Saint was providentially hindered from accomplishing his whole proposed work with his own hand, the secondary portion of it has since been carried out by various religious bodies either formed on his idea, or called into existence by the same urgent needs which were first perceived and measured by his searching and loving eye.

The Abbé Bougaud, like many other writers, speaks of the Sisters of Charity of S. Vincent as the realization of the first idea of the Visitation; but if we might venture to express a different opinion, we should say that they were a creation altogether distinct. S. Francis of Sales intended from the very beginning to bind the sisters of his congregation by perpetual vows. They were to be, in fact, *religious*, as that word was understood before the decree of Boniface VIII. restricted its technical meaning to such as have papal enclosure and solemn vows. By reason of their perpetuity, these vows, in the words of Bellarmine above quoted, would in the sight of God have had no lower merit and no lighter obligation than the solemn vows of cloistered nuns. Such vows are now

taken by numberless modern congregations, which give themselves to the service of the poor, by such communities of the third order of S. Dominic and S. Francis as are without papal enclosure, and even (as M. Bougaud tells us) from the necessities of these evil days, by many of the strictly cloistered orders. Experience has therefore fully justified the far-seeing prudence of S. Francis of Sales against the *fears and jealousies* (as old Clarendon would say) of the Archbishop of Lyons. As for the Sisters of Charity, their praise is in all the Churches—the praise of unflinching, untiring zeal, and of a self-denying charity which foregoes not only the joys of earth, but the special privileges and the quiet shelter of religion. “Their convent,” in the words of their holy Founder, “is the hospital, their cell the sick chamber of the poor, their cloister the crowded street, their veil holy modesty, their grille the fear of God.” As he left them so we find them. Few parish-priests, we believe, but would choose the Sisters of Charity from all the institutes of the Church to labour amongst the poor. No others can compete with them in efficiency for active work; but this efficiency depends in no small degree upon the fact that they are not and were never intended to be *religious*. They are the light-armed troops of the great army, and can make their way into the enemy’s ranks with an ease and celerity which belongs not to their more heavily-armed comrades, the weapons of whose warfare are of another kind. They are, as we have said, a creation apart—not the idea of S. Francis of Sales taken up and amended by S. Vincent of Paul—a creation as original and as distinct from the religious life, as the Oratory of S. Philip from the Order of S. Benedict or the Society of S. Ignatius. We cannot therefore admit the statement made by M. de Melun, in his beautiful life of Sœur Rosalie, that S. Francis of Sales “recoiled from the idea of the religious life in the midst of the world, which he had originally intended for his daughters of the Visitation, whilst S. Vincent de Paul had stronger faith in his work.” S. Francis of Sales yielded to the prejudices of the age the immediate accomplishment of his design; whilst S. Vincent carried into effect an entirely distinct inspiration, which did not run counter to those prejudices, “creating the Sister of Charity,” in the words of M. de Melun, “to live in continual contact with the world, separated from it only by the slight bond of a yearly engagement, to live in the midst of it in the continual presence of God, whom she receives at the altar and meets again at every moment of the day in the *crèche* of the newborn infant or the pallet of the poor, and by the bed of the dying. Distinct, and even dissimilar as are the institutes of

the two great Saints of the seventeenth century, they have been alike in their faithful adherence to the spirit of their founder, and to the minutest points of the tradition bequeathed to them by them. Wherever the *cornette* of the Sisters of Charity marks the possession of some fresh field by the army of S. Vincent, the tradition of his rule and his spirit is carried thither unchanged as he first delivered it to Louise de Marillac. And independent as are all the houses of the Visitation of each other, and utterly destitute of the systematic organization and central government usually found necessary to the maintenance of one uniform spirit and one common action in a religious body, they all reflect, as so many dew-drops, distinct yet the same, the light and the love which fall upon them from the glorified face of their founder.

As soon as the question as to the erection of the Visitation into a religious order was decided, S. Francis sought a shelter "for his bees" in the old trunk of S. Augustine, which had already harboured the children of S. Norbert, S. Dominic, and S. John of God, and has since received so many new colonies of labourers for heaven. The breadth and elasticity of S. Augustine's rule recommended it to him as capable of the modifications which he desired to introduce for the benefit of those to whom in his tender charity he desired to open the gate of the religious life.

Nowhere (said the holy Bishop, in the Preface to his constitutions) do we find so mild a spirit as that of S. Augustine; his writings breathe nothing but sweetness; his rule is so filled with the spirit of charity, suavity, and benignity, that it is fitted for all kinds of persons, nations, and characters.

And then he proceeds to draw the outline of his Institute, which was to take its place over against Mount Carmel, to afford room for those who had been hitherto excluded from the Orders of the Church; thus calling, like our Divine Lord, the weak and the infirm to the banquet of the Bridegroom. Thus he expressly commands that the doors of the Visitation should be thrown open, not only to virgins, but to widows; so that they be lawfully discharged from the care of their children; to aged persons, if they be in possession of a sound mind; to the deformed, so that they be upright in heart; and even to the sick, unless their malady be contagious. S. Francis, however (notwithstanding what has been said of him), had no mind to *drive* his nuns *to heaven in a coach-and-six*. For scanty food, bloody disciplines, and broken rest, he substituted a new and severer application of the mortification of the common life, which has been affirmed by many of the Saints to be the severest penance in the religious state. In other

Orders, long hours had been left free between the stated community exercises, which the religious passed alone in prayer, meditation, writing, or other labour, in their cells. S. Francis broke up all this free time into a succession of short exercises, so linked together, from five in the morning till ten at night, as to leave the religious not a moment to themselves, and thus to break their will by imposing a fresh sacrifice at the end of every half-hour. By this continual dropping, any remains of selfwill which may have survived the iron discipline of Monthélon, were gradually worn away, and the strong and ardent character which seemed intended for the austerities of Carmel, was moulded to the humility, sweetness, and childlike simplicity which were to distinguish the mildest and sweetest Institute in the Church, and to transmit to future ages the image of Jesus Christ, reflected in the person of its founder.

The wonderful spiritual growth of the Mère de Chantal after her entrance into religion, was accompanied by a corresponding decline of the vigorous bodily health which she had hitherto enjoyed, as if to fit her by the experience of sickness to be the compassionate mother of the sick; and she passed on a bed of suffering almost the whole of the two years 1616 and 1617, which were employed by S. Francis and herself in the revision and completion of the constitutions of the Visitation.

The same hand which traced the rule for their exterior life was engaged at the same time amidst a press of occupations which fell upon him, as he himself says, "not as a river, but as a torrent," in writing the Treatise on the Love of God, which was composed for the interior training of the religious of the Visitation, and intended especially for their foundress and mother.

The farther I advance (says S. Jane Frances) the more plainly do I perceive that our Lord leads almost all the daughters of the Visitation to a prayer of most entire unity and simplicity in the presence of God, by an absolute abandonment to His holy will, a prayer which our blessed Father calls *the prayer of simple rest in God*.

For their guidance in this manner of prayer, S. Francis wrote this wonderful book, which was frequently interrupted, not only by his episcopal labours, and the continual pressure of his European correspondence, but by the tears of devotion and other supernatural favours which continually obliged him to lay aside his pen. His countenance, while he was writing, often shone like the face of Moses when he came down from the Mount; and on the feast of the Annunciation, as he was

treating of the love of God in the Incarnation, a globe of fire appeared over his head. Yet notwithstanding all these supernatural favours, so great were his humility and prudence, that there was not a page in his book which was not the result of deep meditation, and which was not submitted when written to the judgment of a chosen number of theologians.

About two years after the foundation of the house at Annecy S. Jane Frances was inspired to make the same vow which had been previously taken by S. Teresa—to do, in all circumstances that which should appear to be most perfect. After relating the circumstances of both cases, the Abbé Bougaud proceeds as follows :—

The vivacity of S. Teresa's imagination proving an embarrassment to her courage, her directors were obliged to release her from a vow, the difficulty of which troubled her intellect, though it did not alarm her generosity. S. Chantal, not less ardent, but eminently practical, made this vow thirty years before her death, and kept it without requiring a dispensation till her last breath.

Here we must enter a protest in behalf of that great and glorious Saint, upon whose prudence in making, or perseverance in keeping this heroic vow, these words would seem to cast a doubt. In the bull of her canonization, Pope Gregory XV. uses the words, *A Deo edocta* ; and in the lessons of the Roman breviary we read *Deo consiliante* in reference to this vow. Again, in the acts of her canonization we read (Relat. 2, art. 4), *Deo fideliter reddidit præ nimio amore quo illum propter seipsum prosequabatur ut totius vitæ cursus probat*. How are these words to be reconciled with the fact given by M. Bougaud, on the authority of the Bollandists, that S. Teresa's directors were obliged to release her from her vow ? In the life of the Saint by *Padre Federigo di S. Antonio*, page 144, we find a very clear and sufficient explanation of the difficulty. In 1565, five years after her vow had been made, the minds of the Saint and her confessors were troubled by doubts as to the method by which she was to ascertain in all cases what was that most perfect course which she had bound herself to pursue. By the advice of F. Garcia, of Toledo, her confessor, and of Father Antony, of Heredia, prior of the Carmes at Avila, she applied to her provincial to give faculties to her confessor to commute or annul her vow, in order that she might renew it in a form less perplexing to her conscience. By the authority of her superior, F. Garcia annulled her vow, and directed her in what manner to renew it. At her request he wrote both the abolition and the renewal of the vow with his own hand, in

the following terms:—"Having heard your confession, according to the direction of the Father provincial, and believing it to be expedient to the peace and quiet of your conscience and of the conscience of your confessors, I annul and extinguish the vow which you have made in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." He then adds the following advice:—"I would have you renew the vow in the following manner:—That you oblige yourself to perform that which your confessor shall declare to be most perfect, when you have laid it before him in confession to ascertain whether it be the most perfect thing or no. And I lay down three things as necessary in this case. The first, that the confessor should know that you have made this vow; the second, that you should ask him to make this declaration; the third, that he should declare what is the most perfect thing to do. The vow obliges under these three conditions and not otherwise, for as it was at first made it was an occasion of many scruples to you and to any confessor who might have a delicate and timid conscience.—FATHER GARCIA DE TOLEDO."

F. di S. Antonio well observes that the change thus made in the terms of the Saint's vow in no degree lowered, nay, rather exalted its heroism; for, whilst it diminished its difficulty as regards the intellect, it laid a still heavier burthen on the will, binding her not (as before) to do always that which should seem most perfect to herself, but that which should seem most perfect to the judgment of another.

Of her, then, no less truly than of S. Jane Frances, it may be affirmed that, being *eminently practical*, she kept her heroic vow without need of dispensation until death. We may not attempt, with our dim eyes, to measure the altitude of the stars which shine, each with its own peculiar lustre, in the firmament of heaven, or to marshal the precedence of the Saints in glory; but so much as this may safely be affirmed, as borne out by the common consent of Christendom, that, while none has ever excelled S. Teresa in the loftiest gifts of contemplation, few have ever equalled her in the rare endowment of practical common sense.

Amongst the features of the portrait of S. Jane Frances, which the Abbé Bougaud has restored most carefully and successfully, is her conduct as a mother. From the day when she passed over the body of her son, to do the will of her Heavenly Father, we have hitherto known little of her relations with her children. In his pages that most touching portion of her history is fully related. When Madame de Chantal entered the Visitation three only of her six children



remained alive. She had just married the eldest of her two daughters to the Baron de Thorens, the young brother of S. Francis of Sales. Marie Aimée lived in the Château de Thorens, at about three leagues from Annecy, frequently visited her mother, and, as the convent was not then enclosed, she spent with her all the time of her husband's frequent absence in the army of the Duke of Savoy. Widowed at nineteen, and like her blessed mother by a sudden stroke, Marie Aimée, after giving birth to a child, which only lived just long enough to receive baptism from the trembling hand of S. Jane Frances, found rest for her broken heart in an early grave. She was professed on her death-bed in the Order of the Visitation by S. Francis of Sales, who loved her with the affection of a father and a brother. The restraint imposed upon her feelings by the bereaved mother on the loss of this angelic child was followed by an illness which brought her to the gates of death, whence she was recalled by the application of a relic of S. Charles. Many anxieties were still in store for her with regard to her two surviving children. She had left her son, Celse-Benigne, under the care of the President Frémyot, who had long superintended his education. On the death of the President, she sent him to college to finish his studies, and afterwards to Court, where his name and the memory of his father obtained for him a brilliant and perilous position. To many of his father's noble qualities young de Chantal united others which threatened a resemblance to his grandfather. He gave the reins freely to an ironical humour, which kept him in a succession of duels and adventures, to the continual grief and terror of his mother. When he had reached the age of three-and-twenty she had the satisfaction of obtaining for him the hand of Marie de Coulanges, whose sweetness and piety she hoped would tend to calm and fix the fitful and fiery character of the young man. But, notwithstanding his faithful love for his young wife, and his deep reverence for his mother, he continued to peril his life and his soul by a succession of duels which at last nearly cost him his head. Cardinal Richelieu had determined, at whatever cost, to put down the practice of duelling. He had just beheaded an intimate friend of Chantal, and he did his best to deprive him of the king's favour, by telling him "that the Baron de Chantal laughed at everybody." Celse-Benigne now engaged as second in a duel, which made a great noise at Court, and the circumstances of which were certainly sufficiently scandalous. He had just communicated, on Easter Sunday, at his parish church, with his young wife and her family, when a

summons was brought him to act as second to his friend, Boutteville de Montmorency. Without a moment's hesitation he left the church, hurried to the place of meeting, and fought with his usual courage and success. All Paris was filled with the scandal. Preachers spoke of it from the pulpit, the king was greatly incensed, and Celse-Benigne was obliged to conceal himself in Burgundy. Meanwhile Richelieu caused Boutteville de Montmorency to be arrested and beheaded. No sooner did the evil tidings reach S. Jane Frances than she determined to go to Paris to assist her son (who had returned thither) to make a good death. Meanwhile the English made a descent on the Isle of Rhé, to assist the Huguenots of Rochelle, and de Chantal and others of his friends in like danger with himself offered their services as volunteers in the French army. The prayers and tears of the Saint were not in vain. On the eve of the battle her son confessed and communicated with extraordinary piety; and, after a bloody action, which lasted six hours, during which he had three horses killed under him, he received his death-stroke (as it is said) from the hand of Cromwell.

Joining his hands, says Bussy Rabutin, he implored the mercy of God, and thus died gloriously in defence of the Church and the king, at the age of thirty.

It had been the prayer of his holy mother, as she declared when she received the news of his death, that God would give him grace to die in His service, and not in these miserable duels. This was a ray of joy to her in the midst of the anguish which made those around her fear for her life. "Alas!" she writes, "the least of the fears which I had to see him die out of the grace of God, in some of those duels in which his friends engaged him, wrung my heart more than his death, which was good and Christian; and the consolation that he has shed his blood for the faith surpasses my grief." And she roused herself from her own sorrow to console the young widow, who soon followed her husband to the grave, leaving an infant, afterwards well known as Madame de Sévigné.

Françoise, the younger daughter of the Saint, never left her mother's side; she may be called the first pensioner of the Visitation. A cell was always reserved for her next to her mother's; Marie Aimée, when she came to the convent, occupied one on the other side. "Every morning," says an old manuscript, "Françoise rose early and ran to meet her holy mother as she came down to prayers. A smile and a silent

benediction sent the child away well pleased." The early piety of Françoise was somewhat weakened by her first entrance into the world. She had much of her brother's vivacity and love of pleasure. S. Francis of Sales sometimes gave her a rebuke for her giddiness, but he treated her with the indulgence which her present weakness required, only begging her, as she herself related to some of the Mothers of the Visitation, to say at least one *Hail Mary* every day with all her heart. She added, that she never had failed in obedience to this recommendation. One day when he met her with some vain ornaments on her person he said to her: "Françoise, I am well assured our mother did not send you out in a dress like this." This was the truth, for when she went out of the convent she used to go to some secular house to put on such fashionable attire as the world required, and as her mother would not have permitted her to wear. In 1620 Françoise was married to M. de Toulangeon. It was a marriage, in the words of the Saint herself, "which left nothing to be regretted and nothing to be desired." After a happy union of twelve years her husband died, just a fortnight after the young Baroness de Chantal, leaving Françoise a widow with two little children. She carried her sorrows to her mother at Annecy, and to the convent in which she had passed her happy childhood, and where she had once thought to find her vocation; and after a time of retreat spent under the tender care of her mother, she returned to her home to practise the rule of life which she had received from her, in the faithful observance of which, the once giddy and pleasure-loving girl became one of the most devoted mothers and most fervent Christians of her day. The orphan daughter of Celse-Benigne was carefully brought up by her mother's family, but never lost her place in the love and prayers of her holy grandmother. It is easy to conceive what an additional load of suffering and anxiety all these family cares, which are ordinarily left on the threshold of religion, must have laid on the already burthened heart of the foundress and mother of a new Institute, who was soon to be left by the death of her saintly director to govern it alone.

In all the pages of the history of the Saints there is none more beautiful than that which records the friendship between these two chosen souls, so closely bound to each other both in the order of nature and of grace. It is the very realization of S. Teresa's description of *Love in God and for God*. For thirteen years from the day in 1610 when S. Francis said his first mass in the convent of Annecy, they had laboured together. The Visitation already numbered thirteen houses when the

hour came, although they knew it not, which was to be the last they were to spend together on earth. They met at Lyons. S. Francis with great difficulty extricated an hour or two from his pressing engagements to confer with his beloved daughter, whom he had not seen for more than three years. "My Mother," said he, "we shall have a few hours free, which of us shall be the first to speak?" "I, Father, if you please," replied she; "my heart has great need to lay itself open to you." "What, my Mother," replied the Saint with gentle gravity, "have you still eager desires and strong choices? I thought to find you wholly angelic. We will speak of ourselves at Annecy; let us now arrange the affairs of our little congregation, which I love dearly, because God is dearly loved therein." The Mère de Chantal silently folded up the papers containing the state of her conscience for the last three years, and for four hours the two Saints conversed together on various points necessary to the perfection of the rising Order. S. Francis strongly insisted, contrary to the opinion of many influential personages, on the necessity of leaving each house free and independent of the rest under the government of the bishops and the Holy See. He said, that the more he prayed the more clearly God made known to him that this was His will, that there would be thus greater fervour and no loss of unity or stability: "for you see," added he, "our daughters are the daughters of the clergy, and the clergy are the highest order in the Church." S. Jane Frances was so much struck with the exterior brightness in the countenance of the holy Bishop, which was observed by many during the last years of his life, and by the extraordinary wisdom and sanctity which marked his whole words and bearing during this long interview, that she exclaimed almost unconsciously: "Father, I believe that you will be one day canonized, and I hope to labour for your canonization myself!" And so they parted, never to meet again on earth. On the following morning S. Jane Frances set off on her return to Annecy; a fortnight afterwards S. Francis was struck with apoplexy; and on the feast of the Holy Innocents his pure soul departed to God as the words: *Omnes sancti Innocentes orate pro eo* were chanted in the prayers for the agonizing. He had promised the holy mother that she should speak of her soul to him at Annecy; and no sooner was the body of the Saint, after its triumphal progress from Lyons, laid in the convent chapel, than she knelt down beside it, and laid open to him the whole state of her soul. When she came forth from those mysterious communings it was noticed that the crushing sorrow, which at first seemed to paralyse her whole being, had

given place to a radiant peace and joy which spoke of converse with one now beholding the Face of God.

Jane Frances was left alone in the world with two works before her, in the accomplishment of which the fortitude, which the Church assigns as her distinctive characteristic, was pre-eminently displayed,—the complete organization of the Visitation, and the canonization of its holy Founder. The houses of the Visitation founded during her lifetime amounted to no less than eighty-six. The history of many of these, with the details of the sanctity of their inmates, is next, and only next in interest, to S. Teresa's inimitable *Book of Foundations*.

The decree of the canonization of Francis of Sales was not granted till twenty years after the death of his faithful fellow-labourer; but unquestionably she was the chief instrument in procuring it. Within three years after his death she had taken the first preparatory steps, and her evidence was the most important brought forward on the examination. In 1632 the body of the Saint was exhumed to undergo public investigation. He lay before his assembled children in his episcopal vestments, as if he had not been dead a day, with a majesty on his brow and a peace upon his lips which awed and melted the coldest hearts. The Mère de Chantal knelt motionless at the grille, apparently unconscious of the tumultuous and enthusiastic cries of the multitude, who had forced their way into the church to look once more on the face of their beloved pastor. When all had departed she remained with all the community for several hours in prayer before the sacred relics, which the Commissary Apostolic had forbidden any one to touch on pain of excommunication. Applying to herself this prohibition, which was intended only to ward off the tumultuous devotion of the people, she would not venture to kiss his hand. The next day, having obtained permission to do so, she drew near to the holy body, and as she was about to touch his hand with her lips, the Saint stretched it forth as if in benediction, and then laid it with a gentle pressure on her head. She distinctly felt the pressure, and the sisters who were present saw plainly the miraculous movement of the hand and fingers.

Nine years were still to pass before S. Jane Frances should lie on her dying bed, years in which she was to reach her predestined summit of sanctity through the crucible of a fiercer trial than any to which she had hitherto been exposed. She had been well inured to both interior and exterior sufferings. "My child," she said once to a young sister who was tasting for the first time the bitterness of the cross, "for one-and-forty years have I been overwhelmed with temptations. Am I there-

fore to lose courage? No, I will hope in God though he should destroy me for ever. My soul was like iron so rusted with sin that it needed that fire of Divine Justice to purify it a little." All that she had suffered during those forty years was nothing to the martyrdom which she endured for the last nine years of her life. The Face of God seemed to be hidden from her; every spiritual exercise, even the very mention of the name of God, pierced her with agony; the direction of souls, for which in all her previous sufferings she had always preserved a singular gift of illumination, now became a source of fearful temptation. She could not hear of a suffering without enduring it, nor of a sin without imagining that she had committed it. To one who spoke to her of some interior suffering, "Oh, my Mother," she exclaimed, with clasped hands and tears in her eyes, "have mercy on me, I shall be overwhelmed by this temptation; I see it coming, it is upon me now!" Her one guide throughout this dark night was obedience. She placed herself in the hands of the Mère de Châtel, then Superioress of Annecy, who used in her behalf all the spiritual wisdom which both had learnt from S. Francis of Sales. It was summed up in a few words: "Never speak of these things even to God or to yourself, and never make any examination upon them; hide your sufferings from yourself, as if you felt it not. Fix your eyes upon God, and if you can speak to Him, speak to Him of Himself." But she was soon to lose all human consolation; the Mère de Châtel, who had so long been her support, was taken from her. One after another, her first companions went before her to heaven, and upon the death of the Mère de Châtel she was once more compelled to accept the superiority of Annecy. Her long agony was now nearly at an end. It passed away three months before her death, our Lord being pleased to make use of the ministry of S. Vincent of Paul to give peace to her soul. She opened her heart to him at Paris for the last time. As she lay on her dying bed at Moulins, some one said to her: "Do you not hope that your blessed Father will come to meet you?" "Assuredly," she replied, "I expect him, for he promised me he would."

As she was dying with the name of Jesus on her lips, a priest, who had heard that she was in her agony, knelt down to make an act of contrition for all the sins which she had committed during her life, when there appeared to him a globe of fire which, as it rose in the air, was met by another; and then the two ascended together towards heaven, where they were united to a third, far greater and more luminous. It was revealed to him by an interior voice that the two globes



which he first saw were the souls of S. Francis of Sales and S. Jane Frances de Chantal, and that the greater and more glorious orb was the Divine Essence, to which they were now united. As soon as he heard of the decease of the blessed Mother, this priest, who had been her spiritual guide ever since the death of S. Francis, said Mass for her repose. When he came to the *memento* for the dead, he again witnessed the same vision, by which he was assured that she stood in no need of prayer or sacrifice.

S. Francis had kept his promise—and the eternal reunion of these two blessed souls was thus witnessed and attested by S. Vincent of Paul.\*

In no country has the influence of woman been greater for good or for evil than in France, and in no period of its history has that influence been more apparent than in the seventeenth century. Not a few of the great historic names which fill the first annals of the Visitation were borne by women who had been distinguished in the most brilliant court in Christendom for their beauty, their talents, or their political influence, before they laid all these things aside for the humble habit of religion. A late distinguished philosopher,† wearied of seeking *the true, the beautiful, and the good*, amidst the shadows of pantheism, ecclecticism, and spiritualism, caught a reflection of their rays from the noble hearts of that great century, which made him almost, if not altogether a Christian. In his fervent invocation of these friends of his soul, whose society had in his later years in some measure filled the aching void of his lonely heart and baffled intellect, he names Marie Louise de Lafayette, the high-souled and single-minded maiden, who loved and was beloved by Louis XIII. with a pure and holy affection, and who at last extricated his weak though virtuous will from the bondage of Richelieu, and reconciled him with his neglected wife. It was the victory obtained by seeking to do right, rather than to do good. Louise obeyed her vocation to religion, leaving her vast but perilous means of usefulness behind her, and within the cloister of the Visitation she obtained that mastery over the king's irresolute will, which she had failed to win by all the fascination of her presence.

By the side of Mdlle. de Lafayette appears the beautiful and intellectual Mdlle. de Martignat, who left the Court of Mary de Medici to receive the veil of the Visitation from the hand of S. Jane Frances, and whose long life in religion was

---

\* See his letter to the Nuns of the Visitation adduced in the Process of Canonization.

† Victor Cousin.

passed in continual intercession for souls suffering in purgatory or in danger of sin. Her charity was especially directed to the relief of those with whose perils she was so familiar, the kings and great ones of the earth. The revelation made to her of the salvation of the Duke de Némours, who had been killed on the spot in a duel with his brother-in-law, the Duke de Beaufort, sheds a ray of hope on many a seemingly hopeless death-bed. It was revealed to the Mère de Martignat that in the very twinkling of an eye, in which he felt the sword's stroke, he had had time to raise his heart to God, and to obtain His pardon. She flew to ask permission of the Superioress to offer herself as a sacrifice for that poor soul. "Oh! my mother, I have seen that soul in purgatory, but so low down, and for so long a time, that my heart fainted within me at the sight. Alas! who shall deliver him? Perhaps no one, till the great day of judgment." The Superioress, seeming to doubt the salvation of this soul, "Ah!" said she, "a thousand souls would have been lost, in such circumstances. He had but a moment to co-operate with the grace of God, and he used it. He had not lost faith; it was like a match ready to take fire. The divine spark touched it. Never, perhaps, since the devil has been a devil, was he more disappointed than to see this prey escape him." The intense sufferings which fell upon Marie Dénise de Martignat, and never left her till the day of her death, proved that her heroic sacrifice had been accepted.

As the Sisters of S. Vincent were sent chiefly to the poor, so the Visitation of that day seems to have had a special mission of healing for broken hearts, in that order of society to which its first members chiefly belonged. It was the nobility of France whose sins were to be so fearfully visited and so nobly atoned for, by the hideous crimes and heroic virtues of the Revolution, whose daughters now offered this pure oblation to God; and here they found sympathy and solace for their sorrows, and, more than all, a nursery and a training for their children, which formed the wives and mothers of the next generation upon the model of the foundress of the Visitation. There was scarcely an illustrious sufferer in those days but sought shelter or sympathy from her daughters. Henrietta Maria, the woeful widow of our Charles I., chose to shelter her grief in the cloisters of the Visitation at Chaillot, rather than in the stately halls of the Louvre; Mary of Modena, the discrowned queen of James II., found such peace there as she had rarely enjoyed upon the throne; and Elizabeth de Vendome, the unhappy Duchess de Nemours, widowed by the hand of her own brother,

brought thither her two orphaned children and her almost despairing sorrow. Of all the wounded hearts which found healing under the habit of the Visitation, perhaps the noblest was that of the widow of the Duke de Montmorency, whose heroic youth had been cut short by the vengeance of Richelieu. The niece of Pope Sixtus IV., the great-niece of Mary de Medici—she had brought the old Roman blood of the Orsini into the illustrious house of Montmorency, the most ancient in France, allied to all the royalty of Europe, and prouder still of its immemorial war-cry, “God help the first Christian Baron.” The great Cardinal shamed not to war upon women, and after the fall of the axe which left her desolate, the young Duchess was confined a close prisoner in the castle of Moulins. Hearing that S. Jane Frances was at Lyons, she asked in vain to see her. All that the Saint could do was to send her a letter full of tender consolation, in which she assured her that these sorrows were to serve her as steps to attain a higher degree of perfection. This prediction was amply fulfilled. Almost the last act of the Saint was to give the habit of the Visitation to Madame de Montmorency, whose release from her imprisonment had only opened the way to a life of more austere penance and closer union with God; and it was in her arms and in the convent which she had founded at Moulins, that S. Jane Frances breathed her last.

Amongst the portraits of the great and holy women which adorn the records of the Visitation, M. Bougaud has placed in striking contrast that of one who vainly sought an entrance there—one greater, perhaps, than all in natural gifts, and at one time, it may be, inferior to few in spiritual graces—the celebrated and unhappy Marie Angélique d’Arnauld. A sadder contrast can scarcely be imagined than is presented by the opening and the close of her eventful and once glorious career. An Abbess at fourteen, by royal favour and the evil custom of the time; at sixteen setting her hand to the work of reformation, and, by the grace of God and the indomitable power of her will, bringing back the degenerate and luxurious Cistercians of her house to the coarse white habit and austere spirit of S. Bernard; at twenty-eight effecting a like restoration in the royal abbey of Maubuisson; and when it was done laying down the crozier of that princely house and returning to battle with her own yet unsubdued will in the now silent cloister of Port Royal. When a girl of seventeen, she had shut the grille of her reformed convent in the face of her father, her mother, and her brother, and had fainted behind it. She “had

triumphed over lax confessors and refractory nuns.”\* With an energy and a power like that of S. Teresa herself, she had done a work like hers for her Order against the current of the wills, both of her subjects and her superiors; and she had begun that work at an age when S. Teresa was yet deep in romances of chivalry; but unlike her, she had not, alas! begun her victories by the conquest of herself, and when she first met S. Francis of Sales that work was still to be done. Conscious of her spiritual needs, and earnestly desirous of a remedy, she laid them open to him and besought his direction, being attracted less (it would seem) by his winning sweetness, than by the inflexible firmness which accompanied it, and which promised her a protection against herself. In S. Jane Frances she found a spirit in many respects congenial with her own, and she passionately implored both the Saints to accede to her desire of laying aside the crozier which her young hands had so gloriously wielded, for a cell in the Visitation. S. Jane Frances warmly seconded her prayer; but the holy founder hesitated to receive into his new Institute a spirit which he probably foresaw might endanger its humility and its peace. He died while the matter was still in abeyance. S. Jane Frances had left Paris, and Marie Angélique fell under the ill-omened influence of the Abbé de Saint-Cyran. She became his disciple and his tool; and unhappily brought not only her own community, but every member of her influential and strong-minded family under the sway of his over-mastering and baneful genius. The family of Frémyot belonged to the *noblesse de la robe*, who had hereditary possession of the bar and the judicature. It was a race marked, moreover, by stern inflexibility of aim and lawyer-like subtilty in the use of means. By the agency chiefly of such men Jansenism gained and maintained its hold upon the parliaments of France, and through them upon the nation at large. And thus it was that this noble-hearted woman, who had done such great things and who might have done still greater for the Church of France, became the instrument to foster within its pale that unlovely and unloving heresy which at that time infested her pale. We may hope that she was blinded by her guide as to the judgment of the Church upon his system, for she died of a broken heart when it was unequivocally made known to her, leaving her niece (another Angélique) with a harder heart

---

\* See Father Dalgairns's "Introduction to the Devotion to the Sacred Heart."

and a more stubborn will, to uplift the crozier of Port Royal against the merciful exercise of the keys of S. Peter, and erect her interpretation of the doctrine of S. Augustine and her idea of the discipline of primitive Christianity against the living and loving teaching of the Church of Jesus Christ. “*Look here upon this picture and on this,*” may we say as we close the story of Jeanne Françoise Frémyot and Marie Angélique d’Arnauld. Wherein consists the difference? Self-sacrifice, self-devotion, fervour, love of souls, zeal for God’s honour, we find in both. What was wanting to the frustrated life and broken-hearted death of the one? What sustained the life and crowned the death of the other? Simply obedience to the voice of the living Church, instead of thralldom to a self-chosen teacher. How many souls are withering in our day outside the walls of Jerusalem, hanging on the lips of a human guide, yet within hearing of the voice of the Mother of Souls—less guilty, indeed, than Marie Angélique, for they were never cradled in her arms, yet in urgent need of prayers from all who, by God’s mercy, can thank Him in S. Teresa’s dying words, that they are *children of the Church!*

---

#### ART. VII.—F. RYDER AND DR. WARD.

*Idealism in Theology: a Review of Dr. Ward’s Scheme of Dogmatic Authority.* By H. L. D. RYDER, of the Oratory. London: Longmans.

*A Letter to Rev. Father Ryder on his recent Pamphlet.* By W. G. WARD, D.Ph. London: Burns & Oates.

DOES there, or does there not, exist “a vast body of infallible truth put forth by the Church” on such matters as the following? the legitimate mutual action of Church and State; the necessity of the Pope’s civil sovereignty; the relations of Reason and Revelation; the traditionalistic and ontologistic philosophies; &c. &c. &c. There can be no question of more intimate concern to an educated Catholic layman, who gives his mind to political or philosophical speculation; and none which it is more indispensable that a Catholic Review shall seriously consider. So much is at once evident.

But further, this is a question which acquires quite new and peculiar importance under present circumstances. At this day the world in general is so indifferent to dogma, that men are not tempted to directly dogmatic error; they do not care enough about any dogma to take the trouble of assailing it.

Are you to suppose then that the misbelieving spirit is less active or less injurious than in earlier ages? Rather, as is evident, the very contrary: but that spirit will nowadays vent itself, not in *attacking* the Deposit of Faith, but in *ignoring* it; in pursuing philosophical, literary, historical, political studies, without any reference to the light thrown on them by Revelation. Those perils then to which the Faith is now exposed, lie far more in the sphere of history, politics, and philosophy, than of theology proper. And hence the peculiar importance of vindicating and clearly exhibiting the Church's infallibility in Allocutions, Encyclicals, and the like, which are the very instruments she now adopts for condemning religious error in things secular. Those who deny the infallibility of such pronouncements, in fact deny that the Church is infallibly guarding the Deposit against those particular dangers, which at this moment are far more formidable than any others.

Yet in England several even of those who are most zealous for what they consider the true interests of religion, either have no strong conviction of the Church's infallibility in such Acts, or else actually deny it: and the great difficulty which we have ourselves encountered, has been to awake in our Catholic compatriots a sense of the momentousness of the point at issue. Here it is that F. Ryder has done most important service. He has succeeded where we had failed; viz., in securing the deep interest of Catholics for that whole question, which concerns the extent of the Church's infallibility. Nor will this interest now probably die away, until the matter has been explored and investigated in all its bearings.\*

One principal reason of F. Ryder's success has been, we think, his evident honesty and love of truth. He might have easily contented himself with cavilling at individual statements or arguments which we have put forth; and with ringing the changes on "farrago of nonsense," "dull tyranny," "obscurantism," "monomania." As his pamphlet stands indeed, there is more than we could wish of such vague invective.

---

\* F. Ryder animadvert with some justice on a certain vehemence of tone into which we have at times been betrayed when speaking of this theme. We do not admit that any *proposition* which we have expressed has been at all exaggerated; but we do admit with regret some undue vehemence of *tone*. F. Ryder apparently ascribes this to a peremptory and overbearing temper. Our own explanation is, that it arose from an earnest desire to impress on English Catholics the momentousness of the question, united with a consciousness of having by no means *succeeded* in so impressing them. Our earnest desire was that the question should be fairly discussed and not pooh-poohed; and so far certainly our wish is now abundantly gratified.



Still its main purpose is not to attack an opponent, but to erect an adverse theory of his own; and in this respect he is honourably distinguished from the general run of those who love to assail what they are pleased to call the "extreme" party. His own counter-theory is at least intelligible and unmistakeable; viz., that the Church's infallibility is confined to the Deposit and to whatever may be deduced therefrom by strictly logical inference. And he is thus led to deny the Pope's\* infallibility, not only in the doctrinal instruction which he conveys by Allocutions or Encyclicals, but even in those doctrinal censures (below that of "erroneous") which he expressly and formally pronounces.

One consequence which results from the largeness of F. Ryder's theory is, that he and his antagonist are in a certain sense at cross purposes. Dr. Ward hardly applied himself at all, except to some extent in his Preface, to arguing for the Church's infallibility in minor censures; because he never understood how any Catholic can possibly deny that infallibility. The main stress therefore of F. Ryder's attack has fallen on a point, which Dr. Ward had never very carefully guarded and protected; and Dr. Ward accordingly, in his present reply, has on this particular drawn far more from Dr. Murray's stores than from his own. On the other hand, as to the question of *Allocutions and Encyclicals*, in saying all which was necessary by way of reply to F. Ryder, Dr. Ward has by no means had occasion to exhibit his own full argument on that part of the subject.†

---

\* F. Ryder is not a Gallican; and with him consequently the Pope's infallibility is co-extensive with the Church's.

† We may advert in a note to one of several misconceptions, which have resulted from this circumstance. "How does it follow," it has been asked, "because the 'Mirari vos' is infallible in its doctrinal instructions, that all Encyclicals possess the same prerogative?" But the argument of Dr. Ward's third Essay is by no means open (we think) to that objection. See especially pp. 44, 5. So far as regards the particular case of Encyclicals, the argument of those pages may be thus drawn out. It is addressed to that vast majority of Catholics, who regard it as the simplest matter of course, that if the Pope sends a doctrinal instruction to all the bishops of his communion, and if they accept it, such an instruction is infallibly true. No such Catholic would have dreamed of doubting the infallibility of Encyclicals, except because he doubts whether the Pope *intends* to convey in them any doctrinal instruction. But what reason can there *be* for doubting this? "Because the tone of an Encyclical is so far more rhetorical than scientific: because it contains no intrinsic indications of being *meant* to teach doctrine: and because therefore its various doctrinal statements, however directly and peremptorily expressed, must be considered as 'quasi obiter dicta'; as illustrations rather than instructions." Dr. Ward's answer was this. Look at the "Mirari vos." No other Encyclical perhaps can be named, of which the tone is so rhetorical, and which has so little the intrinsic appearance of being intended to convey

At the same time, while we admire F. Ryder's honesty and straightforwardness in committing himself to so definite and broad a theory, we are certainly surprised at his theological boldness. To deny the Church's infallibility in her minor censures, is at all events (as men say) "to take the bull by the horns." Dr. Ward argues against this very extreme position from p. 21 to p. 25: we will here dwell on only two of his arguments.

(1) F. Ryder will himself admit that no one is a Catholic at all, who doubts the Church's infallibility in her *definitions of faith*. But on what ground can you rest that infallibility? for the Church has never defined it.\* You will rest it on this ground. The Church, you will say, has taught from the first, as *de fide*, that she is an infallible guide to religious truth; and it is involved in this doctrine, that if she *do* put forth definitions of faith, those definitions are infallibly true. But then it is no less obviously involved in the same doctrine, that

---

doctrinal instruction. And yet it is demonstratively certain, through accidentally concomitant facts, that this *was* intended to convey most important infallible teaching. If, then, the doctrinal statements of this Encyclical cannot be considered as "quasi obiter dicta," much less can those of others be so considered. But if they are *not* "quasi obiter dicta," then they are doctrinal instructions; and if they are doctrinal instructions, you admit yourself that they are infallible.

We have called it "demonstratively certain" that this Encyclical was intended to convey infallible doctrinal instruction, because Gregory XVI. himself expressly said so, with unmistakeable clearness, and in almost every imaginable variety of shape. F. Ryder, indeed, refers to a work which the Pontiff published before his accession to the throne, as though one passage which he cites from that work presented some difficulty in the way of our conclusion. But when we proceed in a future number to examine F. Ryder's theological quotations, we shall show with the greatest ease that this passage is in entire harmony with our own doctrine. Meanwhile, as Dr. Ward observes (p. 28), even were its sense otherwise, no other inference could possibly be drawn, except that Gregory XVI. altered his opinion after he became Pope.

Dr. Ward's article however on the "*Mirari vos*" was written before the publication of the "*Quantâ curâ*." Since that Encyclical, no one—be he Catholic, Protestant, or infidel—can possibly doubt that Pius IX. at all events, *has* intended to convey doctrinal instruction in his Encyclicals. For thus he speaks: "Seeing with the greatest grief a truly awful storm excited by so many *evil opinions*, we raised our voice, and in many published Encyclical Letters and Consistorial Allocutions and other Apostolic Letters, *we condemned the chief errors of this our most unhappy age.*"

\* There are a few Catholics of very extreme unsoundness, who actually deny that the Church teaches anything as of faith, except what she has expressly *defined*. (See Dr. Ward's "*Doctrinal Decisions*," p. 2.) These misbelievers are condemned by the Munich Brief; but it may be worth while here to point out by the way one undeniable inference from their opinion. They must hold, if they would be consistent, that the Church does not teach, as of faith, her infallibility even in definitions of faith; and that a person might be a Catholic who should deny that infallibility.

if she expresses *minor censures*, those censures are infallibly just. To deny the latter proposition is as simply inconsistent with belief in the Church's infallibility, as to deny the former.

2. The Bull "Unigenitus" abounds in these minor censures: yet if there is one fact certain in ecclesiastical history, it is that all the orthodox (Ultramontane and Gallican alike) united as one man to assert its infallibility against the Jansenistic heretics. The Council of Embrun, which was specially confirmed by Benedict XIII., called it the Church's "dogmatic, definitive, and irretractable judgment"; and added, "if any one does not assent to it in heart and mind, let him be accounted among those who *have made shipwreck concerning the Faith*." This last too, be it observed, is the very phrase applied by Pius IX. to those unhappy men who should deny the Immaculate Conception. And the same Benedict XIII. declared soon after his accession: "We recognize the Constitution 'Unigenitus' as *the rule of our faith*."\* We are unable to conjecture how a Catholic can doubt, that the Popes claimed infallibility for this Constitution.

F. Ryder's own argument did not turn directly on the Church's teaching, but on the language of theologians. He seriously thinks that the Church's fallibility in most of her minor censures is a recognized opinion in the schools; an opinion avowedly held by certain approved theologians. Now in the first place S. Alphonsus and Viva, no ordinary men, declare it to be actually heretical; Malderus declares the same; and Coninck (a writer of much authority) thinks this view "very probable" (Doc. Dec. p. 41). Take the testimony of S. Alphonsus alone; of which Dr. Ward was wholly unaware, and to which attention has been called by Dr. Gillow, Dogmatical Professor of S. Cuthbert's Ushaw. If there is one peculiarity distinctive of S. Alphonsus, it is his constant reference to the dicta of theologians on every different side. Is it credible then that he can have spoken as he has, if the opinion which he so vehemently denounces is one freely permitted in the Catholic schools? Or had he so spoken, is it credible that the authorities, who examined his works with a view to his process of canonization, should have reported there was nothing in them deserving of censure?

Then it is to be observed, as Dr. Ward points out (p. 25), that F. Ryder has not adduced one single theologian, great or small, approved or otherwise, who has said in so many words that the Church is fallible in any of her minor censures.

---

\* We quote at the moment from the American translation of Darra's Ecclesiastical History, vol. iv. p. 447.

Lugo declares it to be the common doctrine of theologians that she is infallible in all of them. F. Ryder himself (p. 52) says "the schola seems agreed in condemning, as at least proximate to error, the denial that any of the condemned propositions merit the censure which the Church attaches to them." Only he further considers, that various members of that schola did not "demand an absolute *interior assent* to the fact that the censured proposition deserves its censure." The following, then, according to him, was their view: "It is close upon error to *deny* the justice of a censure; but you are not at all required *interiorly to believe* its justice." If a whole class of theologians *held* this very subtle and singular view, is it credible that not one of them should have *expressed* it? that they should all of them have stated the *unlawfulness* of *denial*, and not one of them have stated the *lawfulness* of *interior dissent*? Nay, they all used the word "error"; which surely, in its natural sense, refers rather to *thought* than to the *expression* of thought. In a future number we will consider the various theological quotations which F. Ryder adduces: but you may be very sure at starting that each several passage will be found, either not to express what F. Ryder thinks, or else not really to convey the author's full and deliberate mind.

Our meaning may be made clearer by a contrast. F. Ryder alleges most truly that it is an open question in the schools, whether every censured proposition is certainly *false*; and he quotes accordingly various theologians, who speak expressly on the negative side of this question. But he also alleges that it is an open question in the schools, whether every censured proposition infallibly *deserves its censure*; and here he has not been able to quote one single theologian, who speaks expressly on the negative side.

Even as to Encyclicals and other similar utterances, F. Ryder adduces no one theologian who doubts their infallibility. He merely says (p. 26), "I have never found in the treatises of classical theologians any attempt to ground a certain argument on their doctrinal instructions." But on *his* view, at all events, such an argument has little force. For he holds (p. 18) that Encyclicals never "enunciate any new truth, or even any new logical development of an old truth"; and if this were so, however infallible they might be, they could contain very little serviceable matter for a theologian. In fact however, though they have generally but little which bears on theology proper, they abound in instruction on those various philosophical or politico-religious questions, which at this day so intimately concern the Church's interests. And accordingly we are not acquainted with any approved Catholic writer

whomsoever, who discusses such questions, without carefully regulating his conclusions by the instruction given in these Pontifical Acts; and without implying throughout the infallibility of that instruction. Witness the various controversies in France on liberty of worships and the like.

The preceding arguments, it will have been observed, all tend to the conclusion,—not that Dr. Ward's theory is more probable than F. Ryder's—but that F. Ryder's theory is not permitted to a Catholic; that the Church herself teaches its contradictory.\* We feel deeply that no conclusion, short of this, would justify the peremptory language which we have been in the habit of using.

This consideration replies at once to an objection, which has been brought against us both by F. Ryder himself and by others. "Your doctrine," they say, "should not be thus recklessly brought before the public; for none can well be imagined more repulsive to inquiring Protestants." But evidently, if a certain doctrine be really part of the Catholic religion, no Catholic controversialist has a right to tell Protestants that it is *not*. The doctrine of Eternal Punishment, of the Immaculate Conception, of Transubstantiation, are all repulsive to Protestants: but Catholics are not authorized on that account to understate or misstate them. Neither therefore may the doctrine of infallibility be understated or misstated; which at all events is not *less* fundamental than the rest.

But there is another important point of view, from which this objection should be considered. The whole question concerns of course, not so much the mass of believers, as the particular class of educated and thinking men. Now no words can be stronger than those used by F. Ryder in pp. 27 and 59, to describe the deplorable intellectual degradation into which he thinks that the theory he opposes would plunge Catholics. We accept his statement as indicating at all events, that the Church's moral training of intellect would be fundamentally different on *one* theory, from that which it is

---

\* An answer from the Sacred Penitentiary, dated Sept. 27, 1825, is to be found in Scavini (end of Appendix 1 to vol. i.), which has a close bearing on this matter. The question was asked of the Congregation, whether persons could receive Absolution who adhere to the four Gallican propositions. The reply was that such persons *are* capable of receiving Absolution, because no *theological censure* has been pronounced by the Holy See on those propositions. In this reply there seems to be an obvious implication, that wherever a theological censure *has* been pronounced on any proposition, those are not capable of receiving Absolution—putting aside of course the hypothesis of invincible ignorance—who will not submit their intellect to that censure.

according to *the other*. Assuming then that the Church herself contradicts F. Ryder's view,—any thinking Protestant, whom he might convert to *his* version of Catholicism, would lose that very moral discipline which the Church has expressly provided for such as him. It is difficult to imagine a much greater calamity to the Church, than that a large number of intellectual men should be brought within her pale on a principle like this.

Dr. Ward expressed his intention of treating in the DUBLIN REVIEW every portion of F. Ryder's pamphlet, which his "letter" did not cover. In doing this, we will also notice every objection which seems to need a reply, among those that have been brought forward by this or that writer in the Catholic journals. We hope, however, we may succeed in replying to these objections, with the smallest possible amount of *personal* reference to our opponents. We have the sincerest respect for F. Ryder, as has every one who knows him; and nothing could give us greater pain, than that a question of important principle should in any way tend to become a personal one. Nor again shall we include among our topics F. Ryder's comment (pp. 20-23) on the "instruction to the Armenians"; because that argument was answered by anticipation (though not by Dr. Ward) in our number for January, 1866, pp. 281-284.\* But the following matters will all have to be handled. (1) The validity of that argument which we built, upon the absolute necessity of such infallibility as we allege, in order to the Church's securely guarding the Deposit. (2 and 3) The questions of Divine and ecclesiastical faith, and of dogmatical facts. (4) A consideration of those passages, quoted by F. Ryder from approved theologians, in which they seem to confine the Church's infallibility within the limits of the Deposit. (5) The alleged equivalency of the censure "erroneous" and the censure "heretical." (6) The case of Galileo. (7) Lastly, and most importantly of all—because we believe this is really more than anything else at the root of the dislike felt for our doctrine—the whole question of intellectual degradation. We maintain earnestly that Dr. Ward is a far greater friend than F. Ryder to true intellectual liberty; and we shall make this thesis the matter of one entire article.

It is quite impossible, however, to state as yet in what order these various particulars will be treated. It is impossible, were it only for this reason, that we do not yet know what

---

\* We are well aware that there are other theological difficulties connected with this "instruction," besides that mentioned by F. Ryder.



reply F. Ryder may put forth. It is very possible that his reply may remove the controversy to a still more elementary sphere; that the discussion may become, even more than it is now, one of first principles. But we are very far from wishing to elude any part of it. On the contrary, the whole body of thinking Catholics, we cannot doubt, will arrive unanimously at a view agreeing in substance with our own, if they can only be induced to examine carefully, completely, candidly, the whole case, as presented by the two respective parties.\*

\* In justice to F. Ryder, we here insert a letter which Dr. Ward addressed to the Editor of *The Tablet*:—

Sir,—It would, of course, be highly inconvenient, if I troubled you with a letter every week in reply to whatever comments on my recent pamphlet might have appeared in your previous number. The satisfactory course will be to wait till the newspaper correspondence has ceased; and then to make a reply, if it should seem called for.

But the case is different when I have to make a retraction; and I frankly confess that the first of your three correspondents in your current number has convicted me of a certain inaccuracy of language in one particular. A few words will explain what that particular is.

It is the unanimous judgment of all approved theologians, that the Church is infallible in all her doctrinal censures; and the Church herself so expressly teaches this, that to disbelieve the correctness of any such censure is materially to commit mortal sin. This is one of the two propositions at issue between F. Ryder and myself: he denies it, and I maintain it. Dr. Gillow, the dogmatical professor of S. Cuthbert's Usshaw, writing to a contemporary journal, points out that S. Alphonsus speaks much more severely on this matter than I do; and I should be surprised if one moral theologian could be adduced, who does not account such disbelief as in itself mortally sinful.

But there is a totally different question, which must not be confused with this. Several theologians argue thus—"A censure," they say, "may be most justly deserved, while yet the censured proposition need not be false. A proposition which is true in itself may really, nevertheless, be 'temerarious' or 'malè sonans' under existing circumstances." Other theologians—I believe far more numerous than the former—differ from this view.

For myself I follow this latter class of theologians and not the former. But I fully admit that the question is entirely open, and that no Catholic is required to regard every *condemned* proposition as certainly *false*. And your correspondent has shown, by various citations from my work on "Doctrinal Decisions," that I have not expressed my meaning on this head with sufficient clearness. I have only, therefore, to express my regret at the inaccuracy of my language; and to explain that I never considered this particular question as otherwise than perfectly open and debateable among Catholics.

In conclusion, I thank your three correspondents, the two who write against me not less than the one who writes in my favour, for their uniformly courteous and kind language.

I remain, Sir, faithfully yours,

W. G. WARD.

## ART. VIII.—THE HOLY SEE AND THE SPANISH INQUISITION.

*Der Cardinal Ximenes und die Kirchlichen Zustände Spaniens am Ende des 15, und Anfange des 16 Jahrhunderts.* Von C. J. HEFELE. Tübingen, 1844.

**I**N our number for last January the progress of the Inquisition was traced from its first foundation by Gregory IX., in 1229, until the object of its creation was accomplished, the annihilation of the Manichæan heresy. It was shown that a pestilential paganism had sprung up, in the beginning of the third century, so seductive in its influence, that it spread in a short time over the greater part of the Roman Empire, and menaced both Church and civil governments by its dangerous inroads. Its tendency was to substitute monstrous vices for piety and virtue, and to set up the worship of the devil in the place of the worship of God. Christian monarchy succeeded pagan emperors in endeavouring to extirpate it; but its mantle of hypocrisy facilitated its escaping detection, and their efforts proved unavailing. At the commencement of the thirteenth century it had undermined all Europe. The Byzantine standard, Venetian commerce, and apostate crusaders, had carried it to innumerable firesides, and a deluge of obscene barbarism threatened to engulf thrones and peoples. The brute violence of selfish rulers had inflamed rather than subdued the evil, and Manichæism must have broken down the barriers which the Saracens had not been able to efface, had no higher authority than the secular existed.

But the Popes of Rome claimed the right, founded in the infallible certainty of their being the exclusive repository of truth on earth, of despotically rebuking error, whatsoever form it might assume; and they discharged their divinely imposed duty by erecting a tribunal to eradicate the odious heresy, at the same time that it shielded its sectaries from legal outrage. The success of this tribunal, to which was given the name of the Inquisition, was so astounding, that it saved Europe from being distracted by religious wars, conciliated heretics, abolished crime, restored order, rescued (by converting them) hordes of criminals from the inexorable penal laws of the age; and destroyed, in less than a hundred years, a frightful moral scourge which had withstood every

other form of opposition during ten centuries. No other means could have accomplished this result, and it is safe to conclude that, had the Holy Office never existed, the ages of progress and civilization which followed, would have afforded a sad narrative of anarchy, crime, desolation, and blood. The successors of S. Peter merit the gratitude of mankind for the establishment of an institution, whose wise and merciful administration of the powers delegated to it, averted the most desolating calamities from Christendom.

After the decline of the Manichæan heresy, the Inquisition sank into a preventive tribunal, at the commencement of the fifteenth century, of small account in Europe. In many places it had totally disappeared; in others, as in Arragon, the succession of distinguished men who served as grand inquisitors, enables us to trace its continuance; although, even in the history of that kingdom, it is scarcely mentioned for over seventy years, after the death, in 1383, of Nicholas Eymerick. In 1460, in consequence of complaints which were raised by P. Alphonsus Espina, a Franciscan monk, and therefore not naturally friendly towards the Dominican friars, that Castile possessed no grand inquisitor, Antonio Ricci, provincial of the Dominicans, was named by Paul II. to that station.\* He seems to have had no successor, and at the commencement of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the office remained unfilled. Nevertheless, from Castile, under the auspices of these wise and enlightened monarchs, the Inquisition was destined to make a matured reappearance, under another form, against new enemies, and to fill an intricate and gloomy page in modern history. It will be needful, however, to consider, historically, the causes of the critical condition to which the kingdoms of the Spanish peninsula had become reduced by the Jews and the Moors at the close of the fifteenth century, and to weigh the dangers to which Christianity was exposed of being overwhelmed by their enmity or treason, before we can appreciate the motives which induced the co-operation of the Church in reviving that institution.

Ancient monuments have led some writers to surmise that Jews began to settle in Spain as early as the time of Solomon; but they, more probably, colonized from Africa about a hundred years before the birth of Christ, soon after which they appear in possession of much power, and distinguished by a proselytizing spirit.† Their numbers and wealth had increased to such

---

\* *Hefele*. Cardinal Ximenes, s. 256.

† *Jost*. Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage Theil v. S. 13, 17.

a degree, in the first centuries of our era, that they ventured an attempt to judaize the entire peninsula. In 303-313 their worship had become so general, that a Synod, held at the ancient city of Eliberis, near where Granada was afterwards founded, prohibited Christians from having recourse to Hebrew Rabbins to bless their lands; forbade intermarriages with Jews, on account of the many families that had lost their faith by such alliances; and interdicted unnecessary intercourse with them, to both priests and laymen.\* Two centuries and a half later, in 589, the third Council of Toledo renewed the decree against the intermarriage of Christians with Jewish families; and, to prevent the growing crime among the Jews of kidnapping and making eunuchs of Christian children, whom they sold into bondage, issued an edict that every slave so mutilated should be restored to freedom.† These laws, however, appear to have been so ill executed that Jews succeeded in buying the protection of even some of the clergy—a shameful abuse, which was rebuked by the fourth Council of Toledo, in 633.‡ The fifty-fourth canon of this Council forbade the attempts made by some of the Visigoth kings to force Jews to embrace Christianity; but commanded that baptized Jews should remain true to their faith. In canon fifty-nine it was enacted that, as many pretended converts secretly adhered to Judaism, the law of King Sisenand, compelling such to return to Christianity, should be enforced; and, to prevent further apostacies, baptized Jews were prohibited, in canon sixty-two, from communicating with those who had not been baptized.§

This distinction, thus early drawn in Spain between real Jews and pretended converts to the Christian faith, must be most carefully remarked and remembered; as they were ever afterwards considered two separate classes, the former of which was to be allowed the free exercise of its religion, while the delinquents of the latter, on account of their duplicity, were subjected to punishment.

The severity with which the Visigoth kings, seconded by the ecclesiastical legislation of the fourth, sixth, twelfth, and sixteenth Synods of Toledo, restricted the civil rights of the Jews,|| unfortunately fostered dissimulation among them, and multiplied the number of hypocritical conversions. During the reign of King Egica, a widely extended

---

\* *Hardouin*, t. i., p. 255. Can. 49, 50. 16.

† *Hardouin*, t. iii., p. 481. Can. 14. *Gfrörer*, *Geschichte der Carolinger*, i Band. S. 113, 114.

‡ *Hardouin*, t. iii., p. 590. Can. 58.

§ *Hardouin*, t. iii., p. 590.

|| *Hardouin*, t. iii., pp. 591, 1,723, 1,793.

conspiracy, of which we have some account in the seventeenth Synod of Toledo, was discovered between these false Christians and the Saracens in Africa, to overthrow the Visigoth monarchy, and found a western Jerusalem. It was crushed by the Government and followed by severe retribution: the Moors were defeated, and their apostate Spanish allies punished with slavery.\* The Jews, however, soon recovered from this calamity, and, not long after, in the beginning of the eighth century, appear to have facilitated, by their intrigues, the Saracenic invasion of the country.† After the famous battle of Xeres de la Frontera, in 711, had brought the peninsula under Mahomedan dominion, they richly profited by these alliances. From that time, as long as the Saracen rule continued, they enjoyed a position, as a people, which they have never obtained in any other part of Christendom. They accumulated riches; attained power, influence, and the highest political aggrandizement; could boast of men distinguished for learning and their contributions to practical science; founded, at Cordova, Toledo, Barcelona, and Granada, schools and academies, as celebrated and flourishing as any of that period;‡ and from the beginning of the eighth, until the end of the fourteenth century, were favoured by almost uninterrupted prosperity.§

During the ages of religious war between the Spaniards and Moors, in which the Jews were exposed to danger from the Spanish nobility, who regarded them as their most implacable and immediate enemies,|| the Popes and clergy interfered to protect them. An especial Brief was issued, by Alexander II., the friend and predecessor of Hildebrand, to the Spanish Bishops, in which he praises their charity for having saved the Jews from massacre, and the Viscount Berengarius of Narbonne, who had mediated in their favour, received a laudatory letter from the same Pontiff.¶ A century and a half later, at the commencement of the thirteenth century, Honorius III. took their part against the violence of their enemies, and, in France as well as in Spain, their learning gained them the

\* *Jost*, a. a. O. S. 147. *Hefele*, S. 258. *Hardouin*, t. iii., p. 1,816, can. 8. Hefele refutes the statement of Prescott (Ferdinand and Isabella, i. 235) that one of the Visigoth laws "condemned the whole Jewish race to slavery," and shows clearly, from the eighth canon of the Council of Toledo, which Prescott quotes as his authority, that only the conspirators lost their freedom.

† *Prescott*, Hist. of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, vol. i., p. 236.

‡ *Ibid.* 236, 237. "The first academy founded by the learned Jews in Spain was that of Cordova, A.D. 948."

§ *Ibid.* p. 238.

|| *Jost*, Theil. vi., s. 292.

¶ *Hardouin*, t. vi., p. i. pp. 1,100 et 1,116.

protection of the clergy.\* The Popes, however, justly demanded, as Gregory VII. did of Alphonsus VI. of Castile, that Jews should not be entrusted with civil authority over Christians;† and if this policy, which united prudence to mercy, had been observed, many subsequent evils would have been prevented. But the Spanish rulers passed from extremes of distrust to a capricious and inconsistent confidence. From the Visigoth kings to the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, periods of severe administration, in which numberless Jews simulated Christianity, alternated with their sudden elevation to favour and strength, when the secrecy of their hostility made them doubly dangerous to the Church and Kingdom; until every hamlet, trade, profession, and rank became filled with Judaizing Christians, abhorring the creed they had adopted, and the government to which they professed attachment, and forming an immense hidden army of irreconcilable enemies within the State.

After the accession to the throne, in 1280, of Alphonsus the Tenth, the astrologian, who loved and cherished the Jews, on account of their astronomical knowledge, they acquired almost as great a power under the Castilian kings as had been confided to them by the Moors themselves. Jews filled the offices of stewards, administrators, and treasurers of kings and grantees; they were nearly the exclusive vendors of drugs in Spain, and the medical skill they had acquired from the Moors gave them access to all families and secrets; they were tried by their own judges, and possessed laws and rights which gave them frequent advantages over their Christian opponents; and, in common with the Spanish nobles, enjoyed the preposterous privilege of being exempted from imprisonment, except by royal mandate.‡ Urgent but vain remonstrances were made to the Crown by the Cortes and ecclesiastical councils against such immunities, and popular tumults bore occasional testimony to the hatred of the people towards these dangerous aliens.§ They continued in favour during the reigns of Alphonsus the Tenth and Eleventh, Peter the Cruel, Henry the Second, and other princes, at whose courts we meet with Jewish statesmen, ministers of finance, and royal favourites, who held the reins of government, and controlled the destinies of Spain.||

But, if such was the progress made by the real Jews, vastly

---

\* *Jost*, *Theil* vi., s. 293, 302.

† *Hardouin*, l. c., p. 1479.

‡ *Hefele*, *Card. Ximenes*, s. 259. *Jost*, *Thl* vi., s. 296.

§ *Hefele*, s. 260. *Jost*, *Thl* vi., s. 318-321, 324-327, and *Thl* vii., s. 51-53.

|| *Hefele*, s. 260. *Prescott*, vol. i., pp. 238, 239.



more dangerous did the prodigious throngs of their race become who were driven by the persecution that commenced at the close of the fourteenth century, to swell the numbers of the hypocritical professors of Christianity. The indiscreet and exaggerated encouragement given to Jews for nearly two centuries had thrown into their avaricious hands a great portion of the wealth of the kingdom; but the injudicious rigour which suddenly converted their prerogatives into restrictions, threatened to deliver to them, as pretended Christians, the entire Castilian nationality.\* As a safe shield against persecution, and to promote the accomplishment of their designs, they began to creep into ecclesiastical dignities; aspired to episcopal sees, attained the highest civil honours, intermarried with the proudest nobility, and employed these means, together with their prodigious wealth, to secure for Judaism a triumph over Christianity.† Their feverish proselytizing spirit knew no bounds; and when, in 1472, they sought to buy possession of the fortress of Gibraltar, the key of Spain, there is no doubt that they anticipated a speedy re-enactment of the scenes of the eighth century, and a second downfall of Christianity in the Spanish provinces.‡

At the commencement of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, Jews and Judaizing Christians formed, in Spain, a wealthy, powerful, crafty, learned, fearless, and united people; endowed with the genius which seems peculiar to the children of Israel; existing in the midst of a Christian nation they had thoroughly undermined, bitterly hated, and were resolved to betray to the Moorish enemies with whom it was still involved in doubtful war; and devoted to a desperate, deadly struggle against Christianity, with the fearful odds, on their side, of being able, by a deceitfully Catholic exterior, to fill the ranks of their enemies.

It was a time when a desperate evil required a desperate remedy, and the State would have been wanting in duty had it failed to employ it. It was a time when the Church beheld millions of her children in peril, with a probability of revolution, blood, and Mahomedan dominion, which it was her duty to aid the Spanish government in averting.

\* *Hefele*, s. 260.

† *Llorente*, t. ii., p. 339, n. vi.; p. 340, n. ix. *Jost*, Thl. vii. s. 100.

‡ *Balmes* remarks: "The Inquisition was projected before 1474; it was established in 1480, and the conquest of Granada did not take place till 1492. Thus it was founded at the time when the obstinate struggle was about to be decided: it was yet to be known whether the Christians would remain masters of the whole peninsula. It cannot be denied that the system of repression pursued in Spain was inspired, in a great measure, *by the instinct of self-preservation.*"

In 1474, the feelings of the Spanish people had become aroused to the highest pitch of apprehension. Terror and dismay unsettled every mind, and prognostics of impending change, founded on the ill-concealed, exasperated exultation of their enemies, aggravated their consternation. Auguries of the downfall of Christianity and the existing dynasty arose to the throne from every hamlet;\* and undeniable evidence that conspiracy had already half founded a pagan empire upon their ruins warned Ferdinand and Isabella to desist from no course, however melancholy, to save their kingdom. It was under such circumstances that those monarchs resolved to revive the Inquisition; for precisely the same object that had caused its original institution — to bring to light hidden enemies, hypocrites guilty of high treason, who, under the garb of friendship and attachment, were sapping the Church and State.

The first impulse to the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition, was given by Philip de Barberis, Inquisitor of Sicily, who, in 1477-78, besought King Ferdinand, then residing at Seville, to renew a privilege for the Institution over which he presided. F. Alonzo de Ojeda, a Dominican friar, and Diego de Merlo, a wealthy proprietor of Seville, supported, if Llorente may be credited, by Nicolo Franco, the Papal Nuncius, took this opportunity of laying before the King the necessity of erecting such a tribunal in Castile.† These representations

---

\* *Hefele*, s. 252, refers to the appeals that were made at that time to the Spanish monarchs by the people, recorded in *Pulgar*, "Cronica de los reyes Catolicos," etc., Valencia, 1780, pt. ii., c. 77, p. 136 *et seq.*

*Balmes*, p. 206, says: "It would be wrong, in this affair, to attribute all to the policy of royalty. \* \* \* Ferdinand and Isabella naturally followed the generality of the nation. \* \* \* Isabella, far from opposing the will of the people in this measure, only realized the national wish."

*Prescott* says of the Judaisers, in 1478: "As the task of dissimulation was too irksome to be permanently endured, they gradually became less circumspect, and exhibited the scandalous spectacle of apostates returning to wallow in the ancient mire of Judaism." After giving a one-sided account of the tumultuous movement against them at Jaen, he continues: "After this period, the complaints against the Jewish heresy became still more clamorous, and the throne was repeatedly beset with petitions to devise some effectual means for its extirpation."

† Vide *Hefele*. Der Cardinal Ximenes und die Kirchlichen Zustände Spaniens am Ende des 15, und Anfange des 16, Jahrhunderts. This learned and impartial book, as many of our readers know, contains the most correct history yet written of the Inquisition in Spain. His materials are taken, chiefly, from the "Histoire de l'Inquisition," par *Don Juan Antonio Llorente*, Paris, 1818, in four volumes, which is a repertory of valuable documents, although it contains as much wanton falsehood and wilful calumny as the mind of its author could suggest. The perpetual self-contradictions of this pretended history are its best refutation. For an account of Llorente's

led to the opening of negotiations between Ferdinand and Isabella and the Sovereign Pontiff for the achievement of this object; \* but an effort, suggested by the generous-hearted Isabella, † was once more made, while they were pending, to check, by peaceful means, the progress of Krypto-Judaism. A catechism, directing Christians how to demean themselves, from their baptism until their death, was published by the holy Mendoza, Cardinal Archbishop of Seville, in 1478, and promulgated in all parts of his diocese; and a select number of secular and religious clergy were appointed, to win back, if possible, “by means of friendly exhortation, and a candid exposition of the true principles of Christianity,” ‡ the apostates to the Church. The Vicar-General, Don Pedro de Solis, the Corregidor Merly, and F. Alonzo de Ojeda, were associated in this pious undertaking, to observe the effect of conciliatory appeals upon the minds of the Judaizers. §

Never did mission more completely and decidedly fail of success. The apostates regarded the attempt to convert them as an indication of weakness and terror in the government, and were encouraged by it to display a contemptuous and vaunting tone of anticipated triumph they had never before ventured to assume. They carried their audacity so far as to publish an impudent and biting lampoon upon the pacific plan of Ferdinand and Isabella, teeming with rebellion and most blasphemously reviling the Christian religion. ||

Even the mild Isabella became convinced that coercion must now be employed, in order to save the kingdom from destruction, and her repugnance to seconding Ferdinand in the stern policy he had resolved upon yielded to the pressure of the emergency. ¶ The permission to introduce a new

life, infamous character, and the motives that led him to compose his work, see *Hefele*, s. 339, 348. It is to be deplored that Prescott, in his valuable life of Ferdinand and Isabella, should have been guided by the statements of such a man. His long panegyric of Llorente (vol. i., p. 268, note) would certainly never have been written, had he read the character given of that writer, after his death, by his colleagues and friends in Paris, Mahul and Lanjuinais, in the *Revue Encyclopédique*, of April, 1823; and the distrust of his testimony, which occasionally manifests itself, would have been greatly augmented.

\* *Limborch* says they “earnestly solicited the Roman Pontiff to permit them to nominate inquisitors for their realm.”

† *Prescott*, t. i., ch. 7, p. 249.

‡ *Prescott*, t. i., ch. vii., p. 249. *Hefele*, s. 264, 265.

§ *Llorente*, t. i., p. 146, n. xiv. *Jost*, a. a. O. Thl. vii. s. 73.

|| *Jost*, a. a. O., s. 73. *Prescott*, vol i., p. 249, note. *Llorente*, t. i., p. 146, n. xiii.

¶ Isabella became, afterwards, so convinced of the uselessness of lenient measures, that she left in her will the recommendation to her successors;—

Inquisition into Castile was granted by Pope Sixtus IV. on the 1st of November, 1478. It conceded to the two monarchs the right of establishing a tribunal for the examination of heretics, and of appointing to preside over it two or three church dignitaries of virtuous character, who were required to be either masters or bachelors of Theology, or doctors or licentiates of Canon Law.\* Accordingly, in the early part of January, 1481, the Dominican provincial, Michael Morillo, and his vicar, Juan Martin, together with the Queen's counsellor, Doctor Juan Ruiz, and her chaplain, Juan Lopez del Barco, were named the First Inquisitors.† This was the beginning of the tribunal destined to form such an important element in the future government of the Spanish peninsula.

Ferdinand, however, had fully determined not to have any purely ecclesiastical institution retarded in its action by over-merciful papal restrictions; but that the Inquisitors should be royal officers, paid by, and subservient to, the Crown, whose duty should be strictly confined to determining whether prisoners brought before them were guilty of Judaism or not; and the Pope had been grossly deceived with regard to the formidable position the King intended it should occupy towards his rebellious subjects.‡ On the 2nd of January, 1480, the new tribunal issued an edict, assigning a time of grace, during which such as should confess their errors might receive absolution, and "requiring all persons to aid in apprehending and accusing all such as they might know or suspect to be guilty of heresy."§ It described by what indications the Judaism of pretended Christians might be discovered, and by what evidence those who might advance charges against them were to be guided. If a person made the marked difference in his apparel on the Jewish Sabbath instead of Sunday, which would show that he observed it as a day of festivity; if in accordance with Jewish custom, he had no fire in his house on the preceding evening; if he ate animal food slaughtered in the manner in which it is prepared by the Jews, or drank a beverage held in much estimation by that people; if he followed their observances towards the dead, or turned those who were dying towards the wall; or if he manifested a predilection for Hebrew instead of Christian names for his children, a sufficient conjecture of Judaism might

---

"E que siempre favorezcan mucho las cosas de la Santa Inquisicion contra la heretica pravedad."—*Hefe*, s. 263.

\* *Llorente*, t. i., p. 145, n. x.

† *Hefe*, s. 265.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 148, n. xviii.

§ *Prescott*, vol. i., p. 250.

be entertained to require that he should clear himself of guilt before the proper authority.\*

The criminality of some of the most notorious Judaizing conspirators was immediately pronounced, and they were sentenced to death by the civil tribunals. Prescott relates that within four days of the publication of the edict, "on the 6th of January, six convicts suffered at the stake." Seventeen more were executed in the month of March following, and by the fourth of November of the same year, 298 individuals had been surrendered to the secular arm, and sacrificed in the *autos-da-fé* of Seville.†

Ferdinand had so contrived that the duty, which the Church was bound to perform, and which the Pope could neither refuse nor evade, of declaring where errors in faith existed, should be made subservient to the state purpose of detecting high treason, then identical with Judaism; whilst the Church itself could exercise no controlling influence whatsoever to stay the terrible retributions awarded by the criminal courts of the realm. From that time, therefore, we find Church and State, as hostile elements, combined in accomplishing the same purpose; ecclesiastical royal functionaries designating the multitudes of Judaizing Christians who were destroying the kingdom, yet vainly struggling against the harshness with which an exaggerated instinct of self-preservation led the government, supported by popular feeling throughout all Spain, to sacrifice the objects of its dread. Many Judaizers fled the country, and convincing evidence of the well-known merciful disposition of the Holy See is afforded by the fact, that numbers bent their course towards Rome, and appealed to the Sovereign Pontiff for protection against the cruelty of their king.‡

The indignation of Sixtus IV. knew no bounds when he became aware to what extent he had been trifled with, and that his intention to serve the Spanish monarchs, by converting and preserving their heretical subjects, was defeated by the rigorous measures employed. On the 29th of January, 1482, only one year after the establishment of the Inquisition at

\* *Llorente*, t. i., p. 153, 158.

† *Prescott*, t. i., p. 252. *Llorente*, t. i., p. 160, n. i.—Until the time when Torquemada was made Grand Inquisitor, there was, in all Spain, but the one tribunal at Seville, to which criminals were brought to be judged from every part of the province of Andalusia.—Compare *Hefele*, s. 267.

‡ *Prescott*, t. i., p. 254. *Balmes*, pp. 207, 208. At a later period, an *auto-da-fé* was held at Rome in regard to 250 Spaniards, who had appealed to the Pope. They were all reconciled to the Church, and *not one* was condemned to death.

Seville, he issued a brief to Ferdinand and Isabella, vehemently complaining that he had been defrauded into the publication of the Bull confirming the royal plan for such a tribunal; that the intentions of those sovereigns had been wholly misrepresented to him; and that their new institution was in direct opposition to every court of the kind elsewhere, and contrary to the decrees of his predecessors. He rejects the petition of Isabella to introduce tribunals, similar to that at Seville, into the other Spanish provinces, for the reason that they already possessed them, according to the ancient ecclesiastical and episcopal form. He reproves the Inquisitors themselves, in the severest language, for their harsh and unpriestly conduct; accuses them of having punished persons who were not even heretics; and declares that he is only withheld from deposing them from their office by regard for the two monarchs. He orders that, for the future, they shall not proceed against heretics at all, except with the concurrence of the respective Castilian bishops.\*

The opposition of the Pope only served to excite resentment in the minds of Ferdinand and Isabella, and to confirm them in their determination to act independently of the Court of Rome, by making the Inquisition a purely royal tribunal; but did not induce them to mitigate, in the least, its severity. The command that the proceedings of the Inquisitors against heretics should be accompanied by the co-operation of the bishops, was the only one by which they were embarrassed; and Isabella made instant but unsuccessful application to have it revoked.†

Sixtus was resolved to do all that he could do, to put a stop to cruelties discordant with Catholic principles; and, as his first effort proved to be unavailing, he sent on the 23rd of February, 1483, a second remonstrance against a State Inquisition, in which he refused to grant several new requests of the Queen, and, at the same time, appointed the Archbishop of Seville, Don Inigo Manrique, as Papal Judge of Appeal, to whom all those who were condemned might have recourse.‡ On the 2nd of August, of the same year, as no regard had been paid by the Spanish government to his injunctions, and the efforts of his plenipotentiary had been fruitless, and even contemned, the Pope issued another edict, in which he declared that he himself would, in future, receive appeals from the decisions of the Inquisitors;§ that he took all criminals who might manifest

---

\* The Papal Brief is contained in *Llorente*, t. iv., p. 345.

† *Llorente*, l. c., t. iv., p. 353.

‡ The Brief is in *Llorente*, t. iv., pp. 352, 359, 360.

§ All the efforts of Ferdinand could not entirely destroy the effect of the



repentance under his own protection; and demanded their pardon and the restitution of their property, even though the time of grace should have expired.\* No language can be more touching than his solemn appeal to the King and Queen, by the tender mercies of Jesus Christ, to show pity to such of their subjects as might have fallen into error. The Pope *could* not have done more than he did do. He had proceeded to the utmost lengths the circumstances of the case permitted, to prevail upon the Spanish monarchs to reduce the Inquisitorial system to the standard which had made it, in times of equal emergency, the glory of the Catholic Church. But his endeavours were foiled by the unbending firmness with which Ferdinand and Isabella adhered to their purpose. The Inquisition was eminently popular among the masses, as a means of crushing the higher nobility and clergy, who were more infected with Judaism than any other classes of society; and they knew that they could count upon the applause of the people for any measures, however rigorous, they might, even in defiance of Rome, choose to adopt.† The relations between the Courts became at one period so unfriendly, that the ambassadors on both sides were imprisoned, all negotiations were suspended, and the King recalled those of his subjects who were dwelling in the Roman States.‡ Balmes says, that, “*if the Popes had not feared to excite divisions which would have been fatal, the measures would have been carried still further.*”§ The time did not permit Sixtus, either to lay an interdict on the kingdom, or to excommunicate the Spanish monarchs. The practical effect of such steps would have been to array

---

right the Pope reserved to himself of receiving appeals. The King maintained (vid. *Llorente*, l. c., t. ii., p. 471) that the recourse criminals might have to the Royal Minister of Justice was sufficient; but *Balmes* relates that, notwithstanding “the number of causes summoned from Spain to Rome *was* *countless*, during the first fifty years of the Inquisition, and Rome *always* *inclined to the side of indulgence.*”

\* *Llorente*, t. iv., p. 357. This disproves the erroneous statement of Prescott, that, “in 1483, we find the Pontiff quieting the scruples of Isabella, respecting the appropriation of the confiscated property.” The Pope simply tells the Queen that he is willing to credit her assertion, that she does not persecute the Judaizers from financial motives.

Prescott lived to regret the extent to which he had re-echoed many unfounded charges against the Holy See; and, in a letter to the gifted and pious wife of a late Spanish diplomatist, acknowledged that, had he possessed more full information, he would have written differently. It is charitable to believe that, had he lived longer, he would have modified later editions of his history.

† *Ranke*, Fürsten und Völker von Süd-Europa im sechzehnten und siebzehnten Jahrhundert. Berlin, 1837. i. Bd. Thl. i. s. 245, 248. *Hefele*, s. 279.

‡ *Hefele*, s. 296.

§ p. 209, o. c.

the influence of the Pope on the side of the Judaisers, and thus to ally Christians with these hypocrites, in a warfare against Christianity. However culpable Ferdinand's great severity may have been, hostile measures on the part of Rome would only have aggravated the evil; and the probable consequence would have been the reconquest of the Spanish peninsula by the Mahommedans.

Ferdinand was too wise not to foresee the danger of disastrous distractions among his Christian subjects, that might result from an aggravation of his differences with the Holy Father, and, at length, felt compelled to have recourse to a dissimulated sacrifice of his obstinacy. He, therefore, proposed to the Pope the creation of the office of Grand Inquisitor, to be filled by an ecclesiastic nominated by himself, but to be confirmed by the Holy Father. He consented to invest this new dignitary with supreme control over all Ecclesiastical tribunals in the kingdom, and to relinquish to him the right to appoint all inferior Inquisitors. This plan, superficially regarded, seemed to take away from the Crown the odious right of filling the offices of the Inquisition with its own creatures; to vest the Holy See with a more immediate influence in its administration than it had yet possessed; and to establish a higher power in Spain, to which those who were unjustly sentenced might appeal. Unsuspicious of bad faith on the part of the king, and anxious to mitigate existing horrors, Sixtus IV. did not deem it an unacceptable compromise, and finally gave it his assent.\*

A brief was accordingly issued, in the latter part of 1483, by which F. Thomas Torquemada, Prior of the Dominican Convent of the Holy Cross at Segovia, was appointed the first Grand Inquisitor of Castile; and a second brief, dated the 17th of October of the same year, added the Grand Inquisitorship of Arragon to his jurisdiction. †

Ferdinand, by his subtle diplomacy, had thus entrapped the Pope into approving all that he needed, to make the Holy Office a purely State Tribunal. The wily king had well calculated on the ease with which the Sovereign Pontiff could be blinded, with regard to the qualifications of the individual he might nominate to the office of Grand Inquisitor, and was sure that no Spanish subject would dare to appoint inferior officers over such a tribunal against the royal will. ‡ Torquemada's

---

\* *Hefele*, s. 270.

† *Llorente*, l. c. t. i., p. 172, n. i. and ii.

‡ We learn from *Llorente* himself, that the object of Ferdinand, in proposing Torquemada to the Pope, of whose character Sixtus could, as yet, only know the better side, was to paralyze the effect of the mild Papal edict of the 2nd of August, 1483.—l. c., p. 172.—(Compare *Hefele*, s. 270—274.)

accession to power commences a new epoch, therefore, in the history of the Spanish Inquisition. During the years which succeeded his elevation, he gave it a complete organization throughout the entire kingdoms of Castile and Arragon, composed a code of regulations for its government,\* and established it on the basis it ever after retained, in Spain, of a royal court, under royal control, officered by royal functionaries, and subservient to the aggrandizement of royal power.

Four tribunals were erected—in Seville, Cordova, Jaen, and Villa Real, the latter subsequently transferred to Toledo—to each of which the king assigned a Board of Councillors, to be presided over by the Grand Inquisitor, as a deliberative assembly in spiritual matters; but which in civil and judicial issues, by a majority of votes, controlled all decisions. These councillors could be chosen by the king from among laymen as well as priests, without any ecclesiastical confirmation whatever, not even that of the Grand Inquisitor; so that their plenary power, on all other than religious questions, removed the last vestige of submission or deference to Catholic authority. †

The State had, indeed, gone too far to recede. Judaizers and Jews had become so exasperated by the measures employed to curb them, that no reasonable hope could be entertained of their ever becoming peaceable citizens; and they were far too powerful and rebellious to permit the monarchs to relax the vigilance of their hostility. The inflexible rigor of the Inquisition, at Seville, during the years 1481—1483, had appalled the Jews in the province of Andalusia; but, in other parts of Spain, their opposition to Christianity and their proselytizing zeal were undiminished; and the desperate struggle in which Ferdinand and Isabella were engaged against the Moors, made them fear that the alliance of internal foes with these enemies, might, in case of any reverse to their arms, still prove fatal to the stability of the monarchy. The strife of the two Sovereigns was, certainly, with uncompromising and deadly enemies, and it would be unjust to condemn their general policy, before weighing the circumstances under which it was adopted. It was “under a government,” as Prescott admits, which had paid uniform regard to the rights of its subjects, and pursued a generous policy in reference to their intellectual culture.” ‡

---

\* This code is to be found in the “Collection of Instructions on Spanish Inquisitors,” by Spittler.

† *Llorente*, t. i., p. 173, n. v. and vi.

‡ *Prescott*, l. c. t. i., p. 263.

Nevertheless, the new tribunal was not established everywhere without opposition. The ancient Ecclesiastical Inquisition had existed, undisturbed, in Arragon, for centuries; but the nobility and representatives of the large towns were themselves to such an extent Judaizers, that they succeeded in exciting a tumult against the State Institution;\* and the first Inquisitor, Dr. Peter Arbuez, of Epila, Canon of Saragossa, was murdered in the church, at midnight, while engaged in chanting matins.† “The funds necessary,” says Balmes, “for the accomplishment of the murder, the pay of the assassins, and the other expenses required for the plot, were collected by means of voluntary contributions imposed on themselves, by all the Jews of Arragon.”

The martyrdom of this saintly man, whom Blancas calls, “*Vir justus, optimus, singulari bonitate et modestia præditus, in primisque sacris literis excultus et doctrina;*” ‡ gave a sway to the tribunal in Arragon, fully equal to that it already enjoyed in Castile. It excited the indignation of the populace to the highest pitch. When the report of the death of the Inquisitor spread through the town, says Balmes, “the people made a fearful tumult to avenge his death. They went in crowds in pursuit of the *new Christians*” (as the Judaists were styled by the common folk), “so that a bloody catastrophe would have ensued, had not the young Archbishop of Saragossa, Alphonsus of Arragon, presented himself to the people on horseback, and calmed them by the assurance that all the rigour of the laws should fall on the heads of the guilty.”§

Whilst King Ferdinand and Torquemada were completing their arrangements, Sixtus IV. died; and on the 11th of February, 1486, the concessions he had made were confirmed by his successor, Innocent VIII.|| Sixtus, before his death, had contrived a new method, by which he hoped to save criminals from the rigour of the Spanish laws. Raynald re-

\* Prescott, t. ii., p. 7, says:—“It was particularly offensive to the higher orders, many of whose members, including persons filling the most considerable official stations, were of Jewish descent, and of course precisely the class exposed to the scrutiny of the Inquisition.”

† Llorente, t. i., p. 189, *et seq.*

‡ Blancas, *Commentarii rerum Arragonensium*, p. 264.

§ Balmes, l. c. p. 207.—Prescott, t. ii., pp. 9, 10.—Prescott leads his readers to suppose that the whole people were opposed to the introduction of the Inquisition into Arragon; yet his narrative coincides with the above, and the proofs of ill-will he produces, were confined, exclusively, to the higher classes, which, as he acknowledges, were infected with Judaism. The people in Arragon, as everywhere else in Spain, were not only friendly to the Inquisition, but regarded it as their bulwark of safety against Mahomedanism, and rejoiced in its severity. || Hefele, S. 271.

lates that, in 1485, the Pope issued instructions to the Inquisitors, that they should secretly give absolution to such heretics as were penitent, in order that no further legal pretext might remain for proceeding against them.\* Innocent VIII. adopted the same expedient; and, on the very day on which he confirmed the decrees of his predecessor, commanded that fifty heretics should be secretly absolved. Three months later, he ordered the pardon of fifty more; again of fifty on the 30th of June; of the same number on the 30th of July, and, according to Llorente, repeatedly issued edicts of a like merciful nature.†

Most of these bold endeavours, however, to save criminals were, alas! unsuccessful, and, as Llorente states, were wholly ignored by the Spanish Government.‡

While Rome was thus making unavailing attempts to mitigate the severity of the Holy Office, Ferdinand and Isabella were intent upon giving its jurisdiction a still more extended range. Immediately after the conquest of Granada, in 1492, a royal edict of banishment was issued against all Jews of Castile and Arragon who would not consent to embrace Christianity.§

The Inquisitors, without much, if any, exaggeration, incessantly represented to the Spanish monarchs that Krypto-Judaism could not be extirpated as long as the Jews, by their proselytizing influence, could cause the *Marranos*,|| as baptized converts from their belief were called, to apostatize; and they instanced the encouragement given to Spaniards to marry into opulent Hebrew families, by which the faith of great numbers of Christians had been successfully undermined, as a proof that the Judaizing party still nourished the hope of being able, at no distant day, to establish their superstition as the national religion of the Spanish peninsula.¶ Such complaints were the more readily listened to by Spanish statesmen, that they could not endure to see the most lucrative occupations, the best trades, the commerce of the nation, and a great portion

\* *Raynald*, ad ann. 1485, n. 21.—*Llorente*, t. iv., p. 363., seq.

† *Llorente*, l. c., t. i., pp. 241, 242, n. v.-vii.

‡ *Ib.*—*Hefele*, s. 299.

§ *Prescott*, t. ii., ch. xvii., pp. 135-154.

|| *Hefele* derives the word *Marranos* from *Maranatha*, "The Lord comes" (1 Cor. xvi. 22); but *Balmes* thinks, with more probability, that it was a title of ignominy. "The converted Jews," he says, "were contemptuously called *Marranos*,—impure men, pigs, &c."—p. 207.

¶ For a full notice of the proselytizing endeavours of the Jews, during the time of Ferdinand the Catholic, see *D. Jose Clemente Carnicero*, "La Inquisicion justamente restablecida, o impugnacion de la obra D. Juan Antonio Llorente: etc." Madrid: 1816, p.; pp. 61, 101, etc.

of the wealth of the kingdom, in the hands of the Hebrew people.\*

Still, they never could have accomplished the result they aimed at, had not the treasonable excesses and unpardonable crimes of a portion of the Jews themselves, afforded them an occasion. Animated by a spirit of revenge, for the severity with which the secret adherents of their sect had been treated by the Inquisition,† they disfigured crucifixes, exposed to unmentionable indignities consecrated hosts they had stolen, committed many other shameful sacrileges, and exhibited their hatred of Christianity in ways equally criminal and audacious.‡ Jost, Llorente, and Ferreras mention likewise the warrantable suspicion they were under of having kidnapped and crucified Christian children, as at Guardia in la Mancha, in 1490, and also at Valencia.§ Their apothecaries and physicians were accused of poisoning their Christian patients, and popular hatred and jealousy very possibly exaggerated the isolated atrocities of a few Jewish fanatics into crimes common to the whole nation. It is the misfortune of excited and turbulent times that the outrages of a small minority are visited indiscriminately upon the whole body of which they are members, although the excesses they have perpetrated may be condemned and abhorred by the greater number. Besides mere social enormities, however, the treasonable intrigues of the Jews had become established beyond a doubt. Intercepted letters in cypher had proved that the Moors were concerting measures with their brethren in Africa to regain their lost power in Spain, and the Jews were deeply engaged in these plots. In 1835, when their hopes of successful insurrection were less well founded, a conspiracy had been discovered among them at Toledo, to obtain possession of the town on the feast of Corpus Christi, and massacre all the Christian inhabitants.|| De Maistre well remarks, in speaking of that critical time, that the greatness of the political disorder demanded “the adoption of means alike violent and energetic,”¶

---

\* *Prescott*, l. c., t. ii., pp. 135-140.—*Hefele*, S. 272.—*Jost*, Theil. vii., S. 82.

† *Hefele*, S. 272.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ *Jost*, a. a., D., Theil. vii., S. 56, 81.—*Hefele*, S. 273.—*Llorente*, t. i., p. 258, N. iii., et seq.—*Ferreras*, Hist. d'Espagne, tom. viii.-xi., pp. 132, 231.—*Balmes*, l. c., p. 207.—The oppressive usury of the Jews has undoubtedly been a chief cause of the hatred against them of the common people ; yet there is no doubt that the infanticide, of which certain wild Hebrew fanatics were frequently guilty, occasioned the bloodiest outbreaks from which they have suffered. For additional proofs, see *Raumer*, Geschichte der Hohenstaufen, V. Band, S. 272-273. *Depping* Les Juifs dans le moyen age (Paris, 1834), pp. 118-123, etc.

|| *Carnicero*, l. c., t. i., p. 90.

¶ *J. de Maistre*. Lettres à un Gentilhomme Russe sur l'Inquisition Espagnole. Lyon : 1837, p. 10.



and it is unquestionable that the entire destruction of the Jewish nation would have met with popular applause throughout all Spain.

The pecuniary necessities of the Spanish monarchs nearly diverted them, however, at one time, from the severity of their purpose. Prescott relates that "the Jews, who had obtained an intimation of the proceedings against them, resorted to their usual crafty policy for propitiating the sovereigns. They commissioned one of their body to tender a donative of thirty thousand ducats towards defraying the expenses of the Moorish war. The negotiation, however, was suddenly interrupted by the Inquisitor General, Torquemada, who burst into the apartment of the palace where the sovereigns were giving audience to the Jewish deputy, and drawing forth a crucifix from beneath his mantle, held it up, exclaiming, 'Judas Iscariot sold his master for thirty pieces of silver. Your highnesses would sell him anew for thirty thousand; here he is, take him, and barter him away.' So saying he threw the crucifix on the table and left the apartment."\* The

---

\* Prescott, l. c., t. ii. pp. 137-138. Llorente, t. i. p. 160, n. v. Ferreras, t. viii. § 242. Torquemada seems to have been actuated, in this instance, by a purely patriotic spirit. Contemporary authorities agree with regard to the imminence of the danger to which Spain was exposed from the Jews, and that they brought upon themselves the severity of the government by their treason and crimes. Prescott (t. ii. p. 151) acquits the Spanish monarchs of any interested motives in their banishment, and admits (p. 152) that "Spanish writers, *without exception*, celebrate it as a sublime sacrifice of all temporal interests to religious principle." "The best instructed foreigners," he adds, "commend the act." It cannot be attributed, however, to religious prejudices alone, that the Jews have been regarded as traitors to every Christian state, in which their influence has been allowed greatly to increase; for they were so notoriously protected by the Holy See, during the Middle Ages, that Rome was called the "paradise of the Jews," and Sixtus V. was, perhaps, the first Christian monarch, under whom they acquired equal rights with other subjects. Jews have ever been, and ever will be, not a mere religious sect, but a people within the people, looking forward to the great Jewish empire; to embrace the earth, which is the term of their hopes, and observing a fidelity and loyalty to existing governments, always secondary to this great end. They have, therefore, been regarded as aliens, by pagan as well as by Christian states, and have been frequently persecuted, because their interests have often conspicuously clashed with those of the countries where they have sojourned. Catholic governments, previous to the sixteenth century, were not less favourable to the Jews than Protestant rulers have been, since that period. Luther advised that "their synagogues should be destroyed, their houses pulled down, their prayer-books, the Talmud, and even the books of the Old Testament, be taken from them; and that their Rabbins should be forbidden to teach, and compelled to gain their livelihood by hard labour." Philip of Hesse (1518-67) long excluded them from his dominions, and, when they were admitted, it was under the most oppressive conditions. John George II., of Brandenburg, gave them no other option than conversion or exile; and, as late as the last century, Frederic the Great, certainly for no

sovereigns were overawed by a scene so emphatic, and the edict for the expulsion of the Jews was signed, immediately after, on the 30th of March, 1492.

It decreed, "that all unbaptized Jews, of whatever sex, age, or condition, should depart from the realm by the end of July next ensuing; prohibiting them from revisiting it, on any pretext whatever, under penalty of death, and confiscation of property. It was, moreover, interdicted to every subject, to harbour, succour, or minister to the necessities of any Jew after the expiration of the term limited for his departure. The persons and property of the Jews were taken, in the meantime, under the royal protection. They were allowed to dispose of their effects of every kind on their own account, and to carry the proceeds along with them, in bills of exchange, or merchandise not prohibited, but neither in gold nor silver."\*

All possible means were employed, until the time appointed for their emigration, to induce the Jews to receive Christian baptism; and Torquemada instructed the Dominicans to labour strenuously for their conversion.† High honours were bestowed upon Israelites who embraced Christianity, and three such converts are named by Prescott, who were made secretaries to the queen.‡ But though very many abjured Judaism, the greater part preferred wandering into exile; and Ferreras, who details their numbers by the respective provinces, gives the entire aggregate of those who left Spain, at thirty thousand families, or about a hundred thousand souls.§ They travelled into Portugal, France, the Italian peninsula, and even as far as England, and a considerable number embarked for the coast of Barbary, where they fell into worse hands than those of the Spaniards, and suffered cruelties from the roving tribes of the desert, over the loathsome details of which decency demands that we should cast a veil. Thousands of Jews returned, in

---

religious motive, banished them from Prussia. The Emperor Napoleon, in 1807, confirmed to the Jews the same rights with other French citizens; but found it expedient, the very next year, partially to restrict them. The dangers menacing Spain, in 1492, from their influence and power, were greater than have threatened any state from a like cause, in modern times, and neither the fears of Ferdinand, nor zeal on the part of the Grand Inquisitor, were misplaced.

\* Prescott, l. c., t. ii., p. 139. Llorente, ut supra. † Hefele, s. 274.

‡ Prescott, l. c., t. ii., p. 136, note.

§ Ferreras, t. viii. § 242. Hefele, s. 214. Llorente quotes Mariana falsely, to prove that there were eight hundred thousand Jewish exiles; a number so preposterous that even Prescott rejects five-sixths of it, which still leaves an exaggerated estimate.—Prescott, t. ii., 148.

despair, to Spain, and received the prescribed baptism, rather than submit to which they had before preferred any sacrifice; and, as the sincerity of their conversion may well be doubted, new hordes were thus added to the Judaizing Christians, against whom the activity of the Inquisition was particularly directed.\*

In the meanwhile, the Roman See beheld with horror this increase of rigor it was powerless to prevent, on the part of the Spanish monarchy. Torquemada was three times summoned to Rome by the Pope, to answer the many accusations made against him; but, in each instance, he evaded compliance, and sent an agent to defend his cause before the Pontiff. The complaints became, at length, so vehement and repeated, that Alexander VI. assigned to him, in 1494, four coadjutors, in the hope of neutralizing his power, and diminishing the cruelties of the Inquisitorial tribunals.† But, in truth, harsh as Torquemada undoubtedly was, he would have been instantly removed from power, had he failed to co-operate in Ferdinand's policy; and it would be unjust to lay upon him the entire odium of the punishments inflicted under his Grand Inquisitorship. From the time of his appointment in 1483, until his death, on the 16th of September, 1498, a period of fifteen years, about two thousand persons, in the different Spanish provinces, perished in the flames.‡ Don Diego de Deza, of the order of the Dominicans, Bishop of Jaen, and confessor of Ferdinand, was appointed his successor, whose superintendence of the holy office, embracing a period of nine years, until 1507, includes the most odious portion of the history of the Spanish Inquisition.

At the capitulation of Granada, in 1492, Ferdinand and Isabella had assured to the Moors the "possession of their mosques," and "free exercise of their religion with all its peculiar rites and ceremonies," together with the privilege of "being judged by their own laws, under their own cadis, or magistrates," and "being unmolested in their ancient usages, manners, language, and dress;" but subject, in all things, "to the general control of the Castilian governor."§ The Spanish sovereigns did not, however, consider themselves exempted from the duty of endeavouring to promulgate, by

---

\* *Prescott*, t. ii., 144—147. *Ferreras*, t. viii., § 133, et seq. *Llorente*, t. i., p. 262, n. viii. seq. *Jost*, *Theil.* vii. s. 86, ff. *Hefele*, s. 275.

† *Llorente*, ut supra, n. vi.

‡ *Mariana*, S. J., *Histor. de rebus Hispan.* lib. xxiv., c. 17. *Pulgar*, *Cronica de los reyes Catolicos*, p. ii., c. 77, p. 137. *Hefele*, s. 328.

§ *Prescott*, t. ii., p. 94.

peaceful means, the doctrines of Christianity among their newly acquired subjects. Two of the most virtuous prelates of the age, Talavera and Ximenes, were commissioned to preach the gospel to them, and to win them over, if possible, to the Catholic faith.\* Especial civil privileges were accorded to converts, in order that both spiritual and temporal advantages might combine to conciliate the inhabitants of the subjugated provinces, and attract them to the religion of Christ.†

For several years the charitable work of these two missionaries proceeded slowly; but, in 1499, great numbers in Granada abandoned Moslemism. Not only many Moorish doctors embraced Christianity, but, on the 18th of December of that year, as many as four thousand disciples, among the common people, were admitted to baptism, and so considerable a portion of the inhabitants of Granada was converted that the city assumed a Christian appearance. All this could not be otherwise than distasteful to the more zealous of the Mahomedans; and obstacles of so seditious a nature were thrown in the way of further conversions that Ximenes was compelled to subject some of their ringleaders to imprisonment.‡ How highly he is deserving of praise for his firmness at this point of time can only be judged, among the many conflicting authorities, by clinging to a purely Apostolic standard. Some of his measures, it is not possible to deny, were highly calculated to excite Moorish prejudices, and arouse their heathenish indignation.§ Copies of the Koran, and an immense collection of devotional Mahomedan works, surrendered to him voluntarily by the new Christians, were publicly burnt,|| and the *Elchi*, as the children of renegades from Christianity were called, were taken from their apostate parents, to be brought up under Catholic direction.¶ An incident of this kind led to an open revolt in the Albaycin,\*\* a quarter of Granada inhabited exclusively by the Moors, which, but for the heroic

\* *Hefele*, Card. Ximenes, viii., s. 53—55. *Prescott*, ut sup., p. 401, et seq.

† *Hefele*, s. 275.

‡ *Hefele*, s. 55, 56. *Prescott*, t. ii., p. 410.

§ Even *Llorente* does not, however, blame Ximenes himself; but censures his subordinate. T. i., p. 335, n. iii.

|| The number of volumes destroyed has been variously estimated, from five thousand to a million. Condé says eighty thousand, in which he is followed by *Prescott*. Only those works relating to medical science were preserved for the library of the university, founded by Ximenes, at Alcala. (Vid. *Prescott*, t. ii., pp. 413, 414, note.)

¶ *Mariana*, "De rebus Hispaniæ," lib. xxvi., c. v., p. 238.

\*\* *Prescott*, t. ii., pp. 416, 418. *Hefele*, s. 59, 60.

devotion of Talavera, the archbishop of the city, who had gained the affection of even the Mahommedans, might have kindled anew the flames of civil discord.\*

Both Ferdinand and Ximenes considered the Moors in Granada to have violated the treaty of 1492 by this insurrection,† and the Moors themselves, terrified at the consequences likely to ensue from what they had done, were glad to make peace by embracing Christianity. Some migrated to Barbary, but the multitudes in both Granada and its vicinity, either “from fear of punishment, or contagion of example, abjured their ancient superstition, and consented to receive baptism.”‡ The whole number of converts was estimated at about fifty thousand; but the consequences of such an external and compelled Christianity must have been to put the profession of its creed into the mouths of many who were still secretly devoted to the religion of Mahommed. From this period the name of *Moriscoes*, given to those who were baptized, gradually superseded that of Moors, by which they had before been known.§

The warlike inhabitants of the mountainous regions of the Alpuxerras were excited to open rebellion by the defection of their brethren in Granada from the false worship of their fathers; and the early part of the year 1500 was employed by the royal troops in reducing them to submission.|| As soon as tranquillity was re-established, “holy men,” it is related by Prescott, “were sent as missionaries, to admonish them calmly and without violence of their errors, and to instruct them in the great truths of revelation. Various immunities were also proposed as an additional incentive to conversion, including an entire exemption . . . from a heavy mulct lately imposed. The wisdom of these temperate measures became every day more visible in the conversion not only of the simple mountaineers, but of nearly all the population of the great cities of Baza, Guadix, and Almeria, who consented, before the end of the year, to abjure their ancient religion, and receive baptism.”¶ Their pacification was, however, succeeded by a still more sanguinary revolt among the Arab races inhabiting the distant

\* Prescott, t. ii., pp. 416, 418. Hefele, s. 59, 60.

† Prescott, t. ii., p. 421. Hefele, s. 62. Prescott considers the charge against the Moors, of violating the treaty of 1492, as a masterpiece of monkish casuistry; but Hefele clearly proves that their seditious conduct, even before severity was shown by Ximenes, had fully released the Spanish monarchs from their obligations.

‡ Prescott, t. ii., p. 422. Hefele, s. 62.

§ Prescott, ut sup.

|| Hefele, s. 65. Prescott, t. ii., ch. vii., pp. 425, 454.

¶ Prescott, t. ii., p. 430.

sierras on the western borders of Granada.\* “The rapidly-extending apostasy of their countrymen,” says Prescott, “exasperated them to such a degree that they broke out in the most atrocious acts of violence, murdering the Christian missionaries, and kidnapping, if report be true, many Spaniards of both sexes, whom they sold as slaves in Africa.”† It is supposed that they were also leagued with the African Moors, and counted upon the support of their arms against the Spanish monarchs.‡

It was not until the month of March, 1501, that these new enemies had been compelled to sue for pardon.§ Ferdinand granted them an amnesty; but it was only on condition that they should either be baptized or go into exile. At the same time he engaged to provide conveyance for those who chose to leave the country, on the payment of ten doblas of gold a head.|| Very few emigrated. The greater part remained, and reluctantly became Christians; so that “not a single unbaptized Moor was to be found in the ancient kingdom of Granada.”¶ The firmness of their faith was, however, so much doubted that a royal ordinance, of the 20th of July, 1501, forbade any intercourse between them and the neighbouring Moriscoes, who had been converted two years before.\*\* A few months later, probably by the persuasions of the Grand Inquisitor, Deza, the Moors throughout all Spain were put upon the same footing, and the famous edict of February the 12th, 1502, was issued at Seville by the Spanish sovereigns.†† It commands, “that all unbaptized Moors in the kingdoms of Castile and Leon, above fourteen years of age if males, and twelve if females, must leave the country by the end of April following; that they might sell their property in the meantime, and take the proceeds in anything save gold and silver and merchandise regularly prohibited.” “Obedience was enforced by the penalties of death and confiscation of property.”‡‡

The number who left the country was, again, inconsiderable, as the great majority permitted themselves to be baptized.

The Grand Inquisitor now counselled Ferdinand and Isabella to introduce a new tribunal of the Inquisition into the city of Granada, in order to guard against the apostasy of Moriscoes to Islamism; but the Queen peremptorily refused her consent, and only allowed that the Inquisitors already presiding at Cor-

\* *Ibid.* p. 431. *Hefele*, s. 66.

† *Prescott*, t. ii., p. 432.

‡ *Prescott*, ut sup.

§ *Ibid.* p. 441. *Hefele*, s. 66.

|| *Prescott*, t. ii., p. 442. *Hefele*, s. 276.

¶ *Hefele*, s. 276.

\*\* *Ibid.*

†† *Hefele*, s. 276.

‡‡ *Prescott*, t. ii., pp. 446, 447.



dova might extend their jurisdiction over such of those new converts as should totally relapse from Christianity.\* In fact the Moriscoes were less distrusted than the Maranos, and their lighter deviations from Christian manners, and even observances, more willingly winked at. The mild and noble-hearted Talavera, Archbishop of Granada, exercised much influence over the mind of Isabella, and that prelate had always sought to gain the Moors by conciliatory, rather than oppressive measures.† The Supreme Inquisitor was, personally, as Munos acknowledges in his panegyric of Lebrija, whom Deza persecuted, a kind, good, and learned man;‡ and was one of the few enlightened Spaniards who encouraged Columbus, and contributed to the discovery of the new world;§ but a shadow has fallen over his name in consequence of the misconduct of his assistant and adviser, Diego Rodriguez de Lucero, Inquisitor at Cordova, who abused the confidence reposed in him, and was guilty of many inexcusable cruelties. Peter Martyr depicted him, in 1506, as "*Severus et iracundus a natura, Judaico nomine et neophytis infensissimus*," and a year later proclaimed that his name should not have been called Lucernis, but Tenebrerius.|| An odious process was commenced, at his instigation, against the generous Talavera himself, for no other cause than the protection constantly afforded by the Archbishop to the Moriscoes and converted Jews of his diocese. He was cast into prison, with several of his relations, and was only saved by the vigorous interposition of Pope Julius II., who caused him to be honourably acquitted of all the charges that had been brought against him.¶

In Andalusia, many persons, themselves suspected of heresy, had adopted a system of falsely denouncing individuals of all ranks and classes in the community, in hopes that the vast number of prisoners might compel the Spanish monarchs to grant a general amnesty; but this device became the means, under the credulous Lucero, who imagined heresy everywhere, of involving in prosecutions nobles, prelates, parents, children, monks, nuns, and the most virtuous inhabitants of the province; and the sanction of the Grand Inquisitor was, unfortunately, too easily obtained for the indiscriminate harshness of his subordinate.\*\* The entreaties of Archbishop Ximenes,

\* *Llorente*, l. c., t. i., p. 333, n. i.

† *Hefele*, s. 54, 352. Talavera was, on his mother's side, of Jewish descent.

‡ *Memorias de la Real Academia de la Historia*, t. iii., p. 17 (vid. *Hefele*, xix., h. s. 350). § *Prescott*, t. ii., p. 122.

|| *Petrus Martyr*, epist. 295, 333, 334, 339, 342 (*Hefele*, s. 351).

¶ *Llorente*, l. c., t. i., p. 342.

\*\* *Hefele*, s. 354.

that Ferdinand would interpose to prevent such disgraceful abuses, were utterly unavailing; but the Archduke Philip, of Austria, who, on the death of Isabella, on the 26th of November, 1504, succeeded in right of his wife to the dominion of Castile, was persuaded by his representations to remand Deza to his diocese of Seville.\* The young monarch made the mistake, however, of committing the government of the Inquisition to a board of royal councillors;† and the dissatisfaction created by this step among the Spanish people afforded a pretext, for Ferdinand, after the death of Philip in 1506, to restore the Grand Inquisitor to his office. Deza, blinded by his confidence in his unworthy coadjutor to both his own interests and those of the throne, immediately renewed the prosecutions which had been suspended during the two years of his banishment.‡

A rebellion in Cordova within a month of his re-accession to power, was the consequence. The palace of the Inquisition was stormed by the inhabitants; the prisoners were released; and clergy, magistrates, and people, united in demanding the deposition of Lucero, who had fled for his life from the city. Upon the refusal of Deza to accede to this just request, the commotion spread throughout the whole province of Andalusia; and Ferdinand was reduced to the necessity of sacrificing both the Grand Inquisitor and his assistant to pacify the people.§

Deza, therefore, resigned his power into the hands of the King, and, by a royal edict of the 18th of May, 1507, Ximenes, who, by a papal brief, was at the same time elevated to the dignity of a Cardinal, became Grand Inquisitor of Castile and Leon. The Grand Inquisitorship of Arragon was bestowed upon Don Juan Enguera, Bishop of Vich, and at his death, soon after, was given to a Carthusian monk named Louis Mercader, who died in 1516, when it was again proposed to unite the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of both kingdoms under Cardinal Ximenes. He declined, however, the proffered honour, and recommended Hadrian of Utrecht, subsequently celebrated as Pope Adrian VI., to preside over the Arragonese tribunals.||

The measures adopted by Cardinal Ximenes upon his elevation to the supreme inquisitorial power in Castile were characterised by united vigour, mercy, and wisdom. His

---

\* *Hefele*, ut sup.

† *Ibid.* Prescott, t. iii., p. 250.

‡ *Llorente*, l. c., t. i., pp. 346-348. *Ferreras*, t. viii., p. xii., § 203.

§ *Prescott*, l. c., t. iii., p. 249. *Hefele*, s. 355.

|| *Llorente*, t. i., p. 370, 371. *Hefele*, s. 355.

first care was to provide adequate instruction for the new converts, and particularly for their children. A large number of pastors was appointed in each of the principal towns of the kingdom, whose duty consisted in visiting from house to house, imparting catechetical instructions, and kindly teaching old and young how they should act to avoid incurring the distrust of the Inquisition. \* A decree was also issued to the Mariscoes and Maranos, containing full directions for regulating their conduct, so as to escape suspicion of civil or religious disaffection. † The consequence of these humane provisions, to which even Llorente cannot entirely forbear doing justice, was a perceptible decrease in the number of prosecutions before the ecclesiastical tribunals. ‡

Lucero was cast into prison until he should give account of his barbarous administration, § and the unjust accusations which had been the source of so much mischief under his rule, were referred by the Cardinal to a junta he himself presided over of twenty-two judicious men, who, under the name of the "Catholic Congregation," || spent two years in giving them a mature examination. The result was, that on the 9th of July, 1508, the Junta decided that the bad character, contradictory evidence, and improbable testimony of the witnesses, made them wholly unworthy of credit, and it decreed that the judgments pronounced should be effaced from the records of the Inquisition; that the houses torn down by Lucero as secret synagogues should be rebuilt; and that the honour of everyone who had been implicated in these detestable processes should be considered as fully re-established. ¶ On the 1st of August, 1508, these resolutions were published with great solemnity in the presence of King Ferdinand and many of the grandees and prelates of the kingdom.\*\* Lucero, after languishing for some time in confinement, was sent back to his canonicate at Almeira, covered with the ignominy his barbarous cruelty deserved. ††

Learning was a title to respect Ximenes never failed to recognize, and the academician, Munoz, and Antonio, the historian, both do credit to his noble protection of Antonius of Lebrija, or Nebrissa, who had fallen into disgrace with Deza for comments the latter considered too free upon Vulgate translations of isolated texts of Scripture. ‡‡ The Abbot Lerma,

\* *Hefele*, s. 356.

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Llorente*, t. i., p. 360, n. xiv.

§ *Llorente*, t. i., p. 350, n. xii. || *Ibid.*, p. 352, n. xiii. ¶ *Hefele*, s. 357.

\*\* *Hefele*, s. 357. *Llorente*, l. c., t. i., p. 352, n. xiv.

†† *Hefele*, s. 358. *Llorente*, t. i., p. 353, n. xv. ‡‡ *Hefele*, s. 358.

the learned Vergara, and other distinguished persons, also enjoyed the countenance of this Grand Inquisitor,\* who contrasts so gloriously with his predecessors.

The severity of Ximenes was turned against the functionaries of the Inquisition themselves, and the strictest account was demanded of the manner in which they fulfilled their various duties. Officials who exceeded their allotted limit of power were imprisoned or dismissed, and unnecessary severity in inflicting punishment became, under his administration, a heinous crime.† The secretary of the Grand Inquisitorial Council was himself deposed,‡ and certain offences into which officers of the tribunal had fallen were made punishable by death.§

Some zealot subordinates made complaints to the Pope of the fancied lukewarmness of their Grand Superior; but the answer from Rome was an emphatic declaration in favour of the benign policy Ximenes had pursued.|| During the ten years of his rule it cannot be doubted that capital punishment was, where deserved, inflicted; still, Llorente does not record a single death penalty, although, with his usual malignity, he endeavours, by vague accusations of unproved cruelties, to blacken the fame of this great man.¶

The exertions of Cardinal Ximenes to restore to the Inquisition its primitive character of a purely ecclesiastical tribunal, were, however, notwithstanding his power, and the unrivalled influence he possessed with the King, of no avail whatsoever. On the 11th of February, 1509, he besought Ferdinand that laymen might, thenceforth, be excluded from among the councillors appointed to its tribunals by the Crown. The King answered, that the Inquisitorial Council was dependent upon the Royal will alone, and that he recognized no other rule than his own good pleasure in filling up its vacancies.\*\* Ximenes had no power of resisting; but, when he became Regent, after the death of Ferdinand, lay councillors were dismissed from office.†† In truth, the Spanish Crown was so jealous of ecclesiastical influence, independently of royal authority, that, on the 31st of August, 1509, Ferdinand the Catholic (?) issued a decree, that any one who should procure from the Pope, or his Legate, and publish any document prejudicial to the Inquisi-

---

\* *Llorente*, l. c. t. ii., p. 8, n. ii. ; p. 454.

† *Llorente*, t. i., p. 358, n. viii. ; p. 359, n. x.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 360, n. xi. § *Ibid.*, p. 359, n. ix. || *Ibid.* *Hefele*, s. 360.

¶ *Hefele*, s. 361. \*\* *Llorente*, t. i., p. 359, *seq.* *Hefele*, s. 360. †† *Ibid.*

tion, should be punished with death.\* The religious orders, whose connection with Rome was more immediate, and which were usually exempted from even episcopal authority, were sorely persecuted by that tribunal; and the Augustinians, during Ferdinand's reign, made complaint to the Pope of the grievances to which monks of their community had been subjected.† It is notorious to what a scandalous and profligate extent it has been used, at more recent periods, to limit the influence of the Jesuits, whom no one will deny to have been among the most zealous supporters of the Catholic Church.‡

Decrees from Rome were only listened to, in Spain, during the short period between the death of Ferdinand and that of Ximenes. Ferdinand died on the 23rd of January, 1516, and the Regency of Ximenes lasted until his own death, on the 8th of November of the following year; yet, in that interval, three of the four causes, which are all that Llorente has recorded under his entire Grand Inquisitorship, were interfered with, or decided upon by the Pope; and had the destinies of Spain continued for many years in his hands, he would, by transferring to the Church the government of the Inquisition, have removed the reproach resting upon its name.§

The Spanish Inquisition has often been represented—by very dishonest or ignorant writers—as a despotism of the Church of Rome; but the despotism of the Inquisition, from the time of its foundation until its existence ended, aimed, on the contrary, at crushing the influence of Rome in Spain. The *only check* upon its cruelty was the determined perseverance with which the Sovereign Pontiffs interfered in behalf of mercy; and, by remonstrances, mandates of grace, and even

\* *Hefele*, s. 364.—*Llorente*, t. i., p. 368, n. iii.—Llorente, of course, praises this bloody edict, because it was issued in opposition to Rome.

† *Llorente*, l. c. t. i., p. 365, n. iv.

‡ *Hefele*, s. 280, proves this by the following passage in the celebrated Brief of Clement XIV. in 1773, suppressing the Jesuit order:—"Multæ hinc ortæ adversus societatem querimoniae, quæ nonnullorum, etiam principum auctoritate manitæ \* \* \* fuerunt. In his fuit claræ memoriæ Philippus II. Hispaniarum rex Catholicus, qui tum gravissimas, quibus ille vehementer impellebatur rationes, tum etiam eos quos ab Hispaniarum Inquisitoribus adversus immoderata societatis privilegia ac regiminis formam acceperat clamores \* \* \* Sixto V. prædecessori exponenda curavit."

In 1695, the celebrated Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum*, publishing under the direction of the learned F. Daniel Papebroch, was condemned by the Inquisition as containing heretical propositions, although it had been praised and encouraged by the Holy See.

In Portugal, the Inquisition was used to banish the Jesuits from the kingdom, and the infamous Pombal made it the means of burning F. Malagrida as a heretic.

§ *Hefele*, s. 363—365.

excommunication, moderated its excessive rigour. Julius II. and Leo X. nominated special judges to rescue prisoners, who appealed to them, from the grasp of the Inquisition.\* Again and again did the Popes quash the sentences of the Holy Office, and again and again did they, or their Nuncios, summon its functionaries before them, and menace them with excommunication, if they oppressed any one that appealed to the Holy See.† In some cases the ban was really laid upon them by Rome; as, for instance, when Leo X., in 1519, to the great wrath of Charles V., excommunicated the Inquisitors of Toledo.‡ On the 14th of December of the preceding year, the same Pontiff, to prevent the frequency of malicious accusations, had issued a solemn decree, providing that the death penalty should be incurred by those who might be guilty of the crime of bearing false witness.§ Leo wished entirely to reform the Spanish Inquisition; but the strenuous efforts of Charles V. effectually foiled this, as so many other good designs, and three Briefs, which had been already issued, were prevented from coming into operation by the determined hostility of the Government.|| The Spanish monarchs even intercepted Papal indults to the State Inquisitors,¶ or, with diabolical malice, caused sentences of death to be so hastily executed that the pardon arrived too late,\*\* but they, still more frequently, positively refused to obey the Pope's commands.†† The merciful endeavours of the Court of Rome were sometimes attended with a favourable result; but it was, too frequently, in only preventing lighter punishments, or in saving from infamy the memory of those that were dead.‡‡ Every effort was made in behalf of the children of the condemned, that they might not suffer, in character or in property, for the sins of their fathers; but the Papal decrees in their favour were rarely respected.§§

---

\* *Llorente*, l. c. t. i., p. 457, n. v.; p. 409, n. vii.; p. 411, n. xi.; p. 413, n. xiii.; p. 414, n. xvii. † *Hefele*, s. 300.

‡ *Llorente*, t. i., p. 413, n. xiv., xv.; p. 408, n. v.; p. 364, n. ii.—As early as 1489, *Puigblanch* admits (*Inquisition Unmasked*, t. ii., p. 237), that Sixtus IV. had deposed Father Christopher Galvez, Inquisitor at Valencia.

§ *Llorente*, l. c. t. i., p. 417, n. xxii.

|| *Idem*, p. 396, n. xiii.; p. 398, n. xvi.; p. 399, n. xvii.; p. 414, n. xv. According to *Llorente*, the Spanish Ambassador counselled Charles to excite the fears of Leo, and thus prevent his interference with the injustices of the Inquisition, by affecting to favour Luther. ¶ *Idem*, p. 413, n. xiii.

\*\* *Idem*, p. 343, n. vii.; p. 409, n. vii.; p. 413, n. xv.; p. 414, n. xviii.; p. 417, n. xxi.

†† *Idem*, p. 403, n. xxvi.; p. 283, n. vi.; p. 287, n. vii.; p. 413, n. xi.; p. 409, n. xii.

‡‡ *Idem*, p. 396, n. xii.; p. 363, n. ii.; p. 364, n. iii.

§§ *Llorente*, l. c. t. i., p. 242, n. v. et vii.; t. ii., p. 34, n. xiii.



Even Llorente affirms that the Spanish Government made it a point to take the part of the Inquisitors, in every case where the Head of the Church enjoined what was displeasing to that tribunal.\* In the celebrated instance of Bartholemew Caranza, Archbishop of Toledo, imprisoned on a charge of heresy concerning which it was the province of the Pope alone to decide, the interference of Pius IV., united with the protest of the Council of Trent, were of no avail to procure his liberation.† Throughout all Spain the eyes of every prisoner, Christian, Jew or Moor, were turned towards Rome for rescue, and they knew that, if their appeal was made in vain, it was because the Popes were absolutely devoid of power to help them.‡

Aside from the principles of charity by which the Holy See was governed, it could not but perceive that its own spiritual ascendancy was endangered by the power of an institution in the immediate service of political absolutism, which included among its aims to break down the credit of the higher clergy. At the accession of Ferdinand and Isabella to the throne, the clergy, nobility, and municipal corporations divided the strength of the State, and, from different causes, were all inimical to the royal prerogatives.§ The excessive popularity enjoyed by the Inquisition among the masses of the people is ascribed by Ranke to its humbling this ecclesiastical and civil aristocracy, by whom they felt more oppressed than by the Crown.|| By the higher ranks, on the contrary, the Inquisition was hated, and particularly by the Prelates, more than any other class; because they were involved in endless processes with that institution.¶ It had not escaped the watchfulness of the Popes that the tendency, in all parts of Europe, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, was to centralise power in the hands of individuals; and there is no element more directly subversive of the influence of the Catholic Church over its subjects than their separation from its head by the will of absolute monarchs. It was, therefore, for the interest of Christianity, that the intermediate authorities the State was striving to destroy, should be upheld; and, thus, the Holy See could never countenance a secular purpose,

\* *Llorente*, l. c. t. ii., p. 387, n. iv.

† *Lacordaire*, *Apology for the Order of S. Dominic*, pp. 133, 134 (Vid. *Religious Cabinet*, p. 462). Under Philip II. the Inquisition retained so little of a religious character that it extended to affairs of commerce, war, and finance; AND IT WAS EVEN DECLARED HERESY TO SELL HORSES TO THE FRENCH.

‡ *Balmes*, p. 208.

§ *Ranke*, a. a. O. Theil. i., s. 215, 216.—*Hefele*, 279, 280.

|| *Ranke*, s. 244.

¶ *Hefele*, s. 280.

like that of Spain, of employing ecclesiastical weapons to undermine.

That this was the object of the Spanish Inquisition has been perfectly recognised by Protestant as well as Catholic historians. Ranke remarks, with a fairness he is seldom to be commended for:—"The power of the Sovereign was completely consolidated by the Inquisition; for it gave him an authority from which no Grandee nor Archbishop could escape.

. . . . . It was one of those spoils of priestly power, such as administering the grand commanderies, and filling the Episcopal Sees, which had served to aggrandize the Spanish Government; it was, above all things, in its spirit and object, a political institute. It was for the interest of the Pope to withstand it, and he did so as often as he could; but it was for the interest of the king to preserve its power undiminished.

. . . . . The Inquisitors were functionaries of the king. He had the right to appoint and to dismiss them; like other offices, the Courts of the Inquisition were subject to royal visitations. It was in vain Cardinal Ximenes objected to the appointment of a layman on the part of King Ferdinand the Catholic, to the Council of Inquisitors. 'Do you not know,' replied Ferdinand, 'that if this Council possesses any judicial powers, it is from the king it derives them.' " \*

Professor Leo, at the time he wrote, equally unfavourable to Catholics, expressed himself in a similar manner. "By the Inquisition," says he, "which was an ecclesiastical institute, entirely dependant on the Crown, and was levelled at clergy and laity alike, Isabella contrived to bend the nobles and churchmen of Castile to her will." †

Guizot remarks, "The Inquisition was, at first, more political than religious, and destined rather for the maintenance of order than the defence of faith." ‡

Havemann, of Goettingen, as quoted by Hefele, says, "The king appointed the Presidents of the Inquisition, and drew up their instructions. The confirmation of the Holy Father was only retained to preserve ecclesiastical forms. No Grandee, no Archbishop, not even the knights of the three powerful orders, who had long, by means of their *Fueros*, successfully asserted their independence, could withdraw themselves from this tribunal." §

Abundant similar testimonies of sectarian, anti-Catholic

\* *Ranke, Fürsten und Völker*, Bd. i., s. 242, 245. (Vid. *Hefele*, s. 283.)

† *Leo, Weltgeschichte*, Bd. ii., s. 431.

‡ *Guizot, Cours d'histoire Moderne*; Paris, 1828—30, v., lec. ii.

§ *Bei Hefele*, s. 284, 285.

writers could be given; but even these are only cited to show that the purely State character of the Institution of which we are treating, and its antagonism to Rome, are facts that cannot be controverted.

During the long reign of the Emperor Charles V., the Inquisition continued to exercise its power; although the continued absences of the monarch from Spain prevented his devoting to it the attention it had received from Ferdinand and Isabella. After the death of Ximenes, Cardinal Hadrian united once more, under his mild rule, the grand Inquisitorships of Arragon and Castile.\* Upon his elevation to the Papacy, in 1522, he was succeeded by Manrique, who emulated the clemency of his immediate predecessors. Llorente confesses that, although he erected, in 1586, a new tribunal at Granada, where he discovered that scarcely seven Moriscos had persevered in the Catholic faith, still he caused the Apostates to be treated with the greatest possible indulgence.† Pope Clement VII. took care that they should receive solid religious instruction,‡ and the Emperor ordered that property should not be confiscated from their families, and that none of those who had relapsed into Paganism, should be punished by death.§ Neither were they treated with less benignity by Philip II., under whom not a single Morisco was executed for having renounced the Christian faith.|| They drew upon themselves richly deserved severity, towards the end of his reign, and their entire banishment was decreed, in 1609, by his successor; but these measures were occasioned by a series of revolts against the Crown, and endeavours to establish, in Granada, a throne for the descendants of the ancient Moorish kings.¶

The vigilance of the Inquisition was, however, awakened under the reigns of Charles V. and Philip II., by the appearance, in Europe, of a new element of danger to the power of Catholic sovereigns, and the happiness and welfare of their people; and its activity was mainly employed, during the sixteenth century, in excluding the curse of Protestantism from the Spanish peninsula. Superficial heretical and infidel writers have made the so-called fanaticism of Philip II. in maintaining Catholicity as the exclusive religion of Spain, a favourite theme of obloquy; but his piety and statesmanship in using the In-

\* *Llorente*, l. c., t. i., pp. 370, 371.

† *Id.* t. i., pp. 439-440, n. viii.-x.

‡ *Id.* p. 447, n. iii.

§ *Id.* p. 448, n. v. vi. And this, notwithstanding that Francis I., when a prisoner at Madrid, had told Charles that tranquillity could never be restored in Spain (and the sequel proved his warning to be well founded) if the Moors and Moriscos were not expelled.

|| *Id.* p. 450, n. ix.; p. 451, n. xi.

¶ *Llorente*, l. c., t. i., p. 429, n. viii.

quisition to save his country from the bloody brood of sectaries that were desolating the rest of Europe, merit for him the name of a wise, well-intentioned, and good Christian prince.

The intellectual licence among the common people, occasioned by the outbreak of Protestantism, led to civil discord in every country where it was introduced. The in-itself natural craving for religious unity, underlying the inconsistent and unreasoning passions of the pseudo-reformers themselves, instigated the numerous sects that sprang into existence to anathematize and exterminate each other; and the strange spectacle was witnessed of rulers, who, within twenty years, in the same land, as Calvinists persecuted Lutherans, and afterwards as Lutherans oppressed Calvinists,\* with penalties at least equalling any ever inflicted by the Inquisition. Not to speak of the thirty years' war; nor of the bloody annals of the Huguenots in France; nor of the ecclesiastico-political anarchy in England, Scotland, and Germany; nor of the excesses of the Anabaptists, the sanguinary debaucheries of John of Leyden, and the revolting enormities of the peasant war; it is only necessary to remember that Martin Luther cried out to the German princes to shoot down the Suabian peasants who had followed out his own principles, and raised, in the name of the Bible, the standard of revolt in an insurrection he had himself excited.†

Philip had personally witnessed in England the ever-widening torrent of blood, hurrying on to destruction a nation once happily united in religion, and he had good cause to be jealous of the introduction into the peninsula of a principle, whose first-fruits were anything else than submission to the state authority. The instincts of Spaniards, as of Italians, have ever been intrinsically averse to the enthronement of individual judgment in the stead of external spiritual authority, and, with them, Protestantism could never mean religious emancipation, but an overthrow of civil order and social restraint, as repugnant to the more conservative among the Reformers as to

---

\* In 1563, when the Elector Frederic III. became a Calvinist, he compelled his Lutheran subjects, in the Palatinate, to follow his example, and exiled those who refused to accept the Heidelberg Catechism. Thirteen years later, in 1583, his successor forced the nation, under the heaviest penalties, to return again to Lutheranism! Great numbers of similar examples could be cited.

† Luther's language, in the original, shows the character of the man:—*“Ein Aüfrührisher ist nicht werth, dass man ihm mit Vernünfft antworte—mit der Faüst musz man ihm antworten, dass der Schweiss zür Nase Aüsgehe. Die Bätren haben nicht hören wollen, darüm habe man ihnen die Ohren aüfkneübeln müssen mit Büchsensteinen, dass die Köpf in die Lüft gesprungen.”*

Catholics themselves. The learned Balmes, addressing his countrymen, says of that time:—

“The immediate effect of the introduction of Protestantism into Spain would have been, as in other countries, civil war; and this war would have been more fatal to us than to other people, because the circumstances were much more critical for us. The unity of the Spanish monarchy could not have resisted the shocks and disturbances of intestine dissension; the different parts were so heterogeneous among themselves, and were so slightly united, that the least blow would have parted them. The Moors were still in sight of our coast; the Jews had not had time to forget Spain: certainly, both would have availed themselves of the conjuncture to raise themselves by means of our discords. On the policy of Philip depended not only the tranquility, but, perhaps, even the existence of the Spanish monarchy . . . . He is now accused of having been a tyrant; if he had pursued any other course, he would have been taxed with incapacity and weakness.”\*

The rigor of the Inquisition, practically the mildest and only consistent ecclesiastical court in Christendom, was mitigated in proportion as the danger of Spain's being invaded by Protestantism decreased. At the end of the last century it was only a shadow of what it had been. Under the Emperor Ferdinand VI., in the middle of the eighteenth century, only freemasons, bigamists, blasphemers, sorcerers, and witches, were subjected to its prosecutions,† and, during the long reign of Charles III., from 1759 to 1788, but four individuals were punished by death.‡ Capital punishment was inflicted by the Spanish Inquisition, for the last time, in 1781; just

---

\* *Protestantism compared with Catholicity*, ch. xxxvii., pp. 216, 217. It is curious that Michael Servetus, whom Calvin burnt at Geneva, should have been a Spaniard, who had escaped from the punishments of the Inquisition. Beza and Melancthon highly lauded his severity, and Calvin himself wrote a work entitled: “*Fidelis expositio errorum M. Serveti, et brevis eorum reputatio, ubi docetur, jure gladii coercendos esse hereticos.*” Beza also wrote a book, “*De hereticis a magistratu civili puniendis.*” Melancthon said that Calvin's conduct merited the gratitude of all posterity! Protestants absurdly apologize for the persecutions of their founders by asserting that they were in a “*state of transition*” from Catholic habits. They make the same argument serve for the differences in doctrine between themselves and the heretics of the Middle Ages, and of the sixteenth century. This is, at the very least, an admission of a constant succession of errors. Divine truth is ever one and the same, and so are divine precepts. The doctrines of consubstantiation and impanation are no nearer the symbolic eucharistic theory than is transubstantiation. It would be no progress from Trinitarianism to Unitarianism to assert that there are *two* persons in the Divinity. Exchange of errors in faith is not progress, and cannot be called transition to truth, any more than twice three make five can be called a medium to accuracy from twice three make four.

† *Hefele*, bei Wette und Wetser, T. U.S., 657.

‡ *Ibid*, § 658.

one year before a witch was burnt in the Protestant canton of Glarus.\* We are not, of course, implying that the two cases are parallel; but we think it right to mention the fact. The activity of the Spanish Inquisition was, from that time, confined to the censure of political and religious books of a mischievous nature.

Napoleon abolished the Inquisition in Spain in 1808; but it was re-established as a *political* institution in 1814, upon the restitution of Ferdinand VII. to the throne, and did not finally cease to exist until his death, in 1830.

It may, perhaps, be proper, before closing the subject, to say a word concerning the application of torture, and the terrible *autos da fè*, by which we have all been scared in our time.

Dreadful (says Hefe)† is the conception we form of an *auto da fè* (actus fidei), that is, an act of faith, as if it were nought else but a prodigious fire and a colossal *spit*, round which every quarter of a year the Spaniards sat, like cannibals, to revel in the roasting and broiling of some hundred wretches. But I will take the liberty to assert that, in the first place, an *auto da fè* did *not* consist in burning and slaying, but partly in the acquittal of those falsely accused, partly in the reconciliation of those repentant with the church; and that there were many *autos da fè*, at which nothing, burned but the wax taper, which the penitent, in token of his rekindled light of faith, bore in his hand. Llorente, for example, tells, in proof of the great zeal of the Inquisition, of an *auto da fè* at Toledo, on the 12th February, 1486, at which not fewer than seven hundred and fifty culprits were punished. Among all these, however, *not one* was executed, and their penalty was nothing more than a public Church penance. A second great *auto da fè* again took place at Toledo, on the second of April of the same year, where there were nine hundred victims, and of these nine hundred, not a single individual received capital punishment. A third *auto da fè*, on the first of May of the same year, comprehended seven hundred and fifty persons; and a fourth, on the first of December following, as many as nine hundred and fifty; yet not a single execution occurred. Altogether, three thousand three hundred persons must, at that time, at Toledo, have done ecclesiastical penance, while twenty-seven only were sentenced to death; and Llorente would certainly not misstate the numbers to favour the Inquisition. ‡

Very few processes, recorded by Llorente, resulted in the death of the prisoner; although he, notoriously, sought out the severest cases, and depicted the Holy Office, which he hated, in the blackest possible colours. The Spanish people,

---

\* *Hefe*, bei Wette und Wetser, § 654.

† *Der Cardinal Ximenes*, xvii., H. S., 322, 323.—For this extract the translation is used in the DUBLIN REVIEW of October, 1852.

‡ *Llorente*, t. i., p. 238, n. v.—vii.



he confesses, looked upon the *autos da fê* as acts of *grace*, and not of cruelty; and, therefore, all classes, sexes, and ranks, took part in these exhibitions.\*

The stories that have been told about rackings and tortures are partially true, although they have been greatly exaggerated. It would be easy to show that the Inquisition was milder, in the application of torture, than any purely civil tribunal.† The criminal jurisprudence of people as enlightened as the ancient Athenians and Romans, and of every other land up to nearly our own period, has regarded torture as allowable, and been blemished by its usage; and no nation or body of Christians has escaped the influence of the age which had recourse to it. The Spanish Inquisition is subject to this reproach, of having resorted to torture; but it is because it existed at a period when it was used to a much more odious extent by every other tribunal in Europe.

We have endeavoured, without exaggeration and without extenuation, to trace the Inquisition, through a period of six centuries, from its first establishment by Gregory IX., to the beginning of the age in which we live.

It will be remembered that at the outset in our last number (p. 54) we distinguished, in the most marked manner, between two elements, which have been ever united in the history of punishment inflicted by the Catholic Church for religious error, viz., the claim made by the Church of infallible certainty that all its teachings are true; that all other teachings are false; and that it is endowed with the right to exclude pernicious doctrine and punish heresy; and the principle *cujus regis illius religio*, inherent in every State for preserving unity of belief among its subjects.

The first of these elements, guided by the sublimely merciful spirit of the Divine Founder of Christianity, prevailed throughout the Catholic world during the first epoch of the Inquisition. It checked the savage barbarity of State instincts; interposed a barrier between millions of souls and temporal and eternal destruction, and is the glory and pride of the Catholic Church. It was planned by the wisest of Popes, sanctioned by the most devout and merciful of saints, ruled over by the holiest and most

\* *De Maistre*, pp. 86, 87.

† It was the only criminal court in Europe in which the application of torture was limited. *Llorente* acknowledges (t. i., p. 445, n. x.) that, after the year 1537, it was almost entirely forbidden against the Moriscos; and *Hefele* proves that the Inquisition was incomparably more merciful in its use than any other tribunal of the age (pp. 306, 307).

disinterested of religious corporations, and accomplished ends which Pagan emperors and Christian kings had, during long centuries, vainly sought to attain. Those who are called its victims evoked upon it the benedictions of heaven, and its mild severity emulated the spirit with which the apostles had despotically preached *one* doctrine, for the salvation of the human race, from which they permitted no dissent.

In the second epoch of the Inquisition, the harsh rules of State policy obtained the victory over the unchangeably merciful principles which have ever guided the Christian Church. Judaism and Mahommedanism had acquired an ascendancy in the Spanish Empire which threatened its overthrow. The danger was so imminent in the year 1472 that human probabilities were in favour of a speedy reduction of the Spanish peninsula to a similar state with Persia, Turkey, and the northern provinces of Africa. The chivalrous and haughty nobility of Castile and Arragon, pampered by prosperity, and absence of political restraint, encouraged rather than repressed the evil, and the immense wealth of Catholic dignitaries had acquired for them an independence of the Crown which monarchs, like Ferdinand and Isabella, could not but view with jealousy and wish to diminish. The pestilence of Judaism had, moreover, to such an extent infected the hierarchy, and corrupted the Grandees of Spain, that their ranks were filled with secret enemies of the Church, who were equally hostile to the Crown.

Truly, as De Maistre says, a desperate remedy was required for so desperate an evil! Still, it can scarcely be doubted, that, had the mild policy of the Church of Rome prevailed, Spain might have been saved, as France and Italy were in the thirteenth century, without such an immense effusion of blood. The Divine instincts governing, at all times, the Holy Pontiffs, would have been blessed by the ever watchful Providence of God, who loves mercy, and rejoices in crowning with success those principles of charity, which caused to descend on earth the unbounded love of a Saviour in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

## ART. IX.—IRISH QUESTIONS.

*Irish Emigration and the Tenure of Land in Ireland.* By the Right Hon. Lord DUFFERIN, K.P. London : Willis, Sotheran & Co.

THE state of Ireland does not mend; nor do the signs of any far-sighted and deliberate Irish policy on the part either of the Government, or of the Opposition, or of the members of Parliament who represent the constituencies of that country, make themselves manifest. The Habeas Corpus Act has been again suspended; and it is only too likely that it will remain suspended for the next five or six years. And the wonder is that no one seems to be very much ashamed, or even alarmed that it should be so. Irish Catholic members appear on the whole to feel rather more anxiety at the prospect that the present Government may possibly allow the Ecclesiastical Titles Act to be repealed; and are capable of infinitely greater indignation on the occasion of Lord Derby's giving a pension of £30 a year to an Orange poetaster. We are passing through a session very dismal in the evidence it affords that the Irish representation, sinking fast into the position of a mere tail, or mere end of a tail to either party, is losing all its legitimate influence. A few years ago the Irish independent members held the balance between the two great parties; but then honourable gentlemen at least professed independence. This session it would not be fair to say that they count for nothing, but it would be true to say that they are the first votes discounted in any close party contest or combination. Yet the state of the country with which they are connected is truly awful. Were Mr. Grattan or Mr. O'Connell alive and in Parliament now, one can fancy in what tones the condition of Ireland would be presented to the House of Commons. There is abundant evidence that disaffection is widening its area and increasing in intensity. Popular sympathy with Fenianism is growing in places where the organisation had no original hold. There is no pause in the operations of the Brotherhood. Not a week passes that the police do not hear of the arrival of new agents, provided with abundant funds from America. A very lamentable feeling of settled hostility is growing between the constabulary and the peasantry. The country is still in a condition of military occupation; so is the Canadian frontier.

And President Roberts has arrived in Paris to conclude an alliance, offensive and defensive, with those enemies of God and man, the secret societies of the Continent.

Meantime another session of Parliament is tending fast towards its close, and all the great grievances of the country remain unremedied. The Government is not to be excused for this, but certainly the Government ought not to bear all the blame. For a great part of the session, as long indeed as there was a hope that a change of ministry was possible, a considerable section of the Irish members acted, even on Irish and Catholic questions, in the spirit of a factious party combination; and they have thus lost weight with ministers, with the House, and with the country—and certainly lost more than one great opportunity of doing public good. It is obvious, for example, that the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act is the natural, if not the necessary preliminary to a more wholesome state of relations than at present exists between the Catholic Church and the Government of the United Kingdom; and it is also obvious that its repeal could be more easily expected from the present Government than from the party of which Lord Russell is the head. Yet the only opposition to the proposition, that was worthy of serious consideration, came from Irish Catholic members of the Liberal connection; and if it has taken three months, during which the question has been repeatedly counted out, to get the select committee struck to which the Government had consented in April, it is clear, at all events, whoever else may be to blame, that there were not forty Irish members, Catholic or representing Catholic interests, who thought it worth their while to attend in order to make and to keep a House for the purpose.

Again, the Government laid on the table very early in the Session, two Bills proposing to deal very extensively, and on the whole, we are disposed to think, very liberally with the question of landlord and tenant in Ireland.

An opposition, chiefly composed of gentlemen, never previously very conspicuous in the advocacy of the principle of tenant right, was promptly organized to these measures. It was led by Mr. Gregory, whose only other contribution to the settlement of the Land Question was the famous Quarter Acre clause; and his chief ground of objection to the one Bill was that it did not contain the substance of the other.

That these Bills, if passed, would have effected a final settlement of the question, we are not rash enough to assert; but of this we are confident, that if the majority of the Irish Members had gone into Committee upon them with the determination to use them as a basis from which to shape such a

settlement, then the question of Reform is not the only question on which Mr. Disraeli would have yielded to proper pressure in this year of grace. He knows well that to settle the Irish Land Question would be an achievement hardly second to effecting the Reform of Parliament itself; and the state of opinion in England, the state of affairs abroad, was not unfavourable to a bold line on the part of any government, properly urged and properly sustained. But the Irish Liberals were thinking at the time far more of the wrongs of the compound householder who does not exist in Ireland, than of the tenant at will, who unhappily does; and the Irish Tories, who were mutinous as to the principal provisions of the Tenants' Compensation Bill, seeing their advantage, brought a strong party pressure to bear on the Chief Secretary. Lord Naas has not as yet actually abandoned his Bills, but, of course, there is little, if any hope now, that they can be carried this year. And, indeed, so long as the Irish Tories, acting in the interest of the landlord class, are seconded by the Irish Liberals acting in the interest of party, it will be impossible to pass any beneficial measure on this subject.

Meantime, if the wrongs of Ireland could be cured by writing, then indeed we might begin to hope that that country was nigh hand to redemption. The Irish Question is passing from the stage of newspaper articles and correspondence into the stage of brochures and books. Ireland has been more written on within the last six months than in any six years since O'Connell's death:—and not altogether ineffectually. A very strong English public opinion is forming on the subject of Irish policy—to some degree regarding the necessity of a large measure of tenant right, but even more so in relation to the less pressing question of the Church Establishment. Another Irish question which has made comparatively silent but not less effectual progress is that of Denominational education. No one, who marks the signs of the times, can doubt that if the Irish Catholic members are really in earnest on this question, and can be brought to conduct themselves with common policy, it may be possible within the next year or two to achieve all that the Irish Bishops have asked in every department of education, from the Catholic University to the common school.

But, after all, the great and primary question for statesmen with regard to Ireland is how to abolish Fenianism—is how to make the Irish people as loyal and contented as the English and the Scotch are. The secret of this is absolutely in the question of land tenure. The Irish people is a people with no considerable industry except agriculture, intensely devoted

to that industry, and with apparently no natural capacity at present for any other industry. The law of the land is such that persons pursuing that industry cannot, as a rule, legally acquire property, or are, at least, liable to be arbitrarily deprived of it, or to be rack-rented for producing it. And the common custom of Irish landlords is such that these courses, upon their part, are not regarded as dishonourable; and the present tendency of their custom and system of management is to reduce their people more and more to the condition of tenants-at-will—which is a condition rather worse than serfage, as it was formerly practised in Russia, and is, indeed, in its helplessness against wrong and its utterness of subjection almost analogous to that of cattle. These being the conditions which the law permits between the two great castes, each tends to disown its duties to the country. The Irish landlord, if he be rich enough, lives anywhere but on his property. The Irish tenant escapes with his despair and his vengeance to a country where every man can own the land he occupies; and where an Irish bailiff or an Irish agent would be regarded as creatures only fit to be added to Mr. Barnum's museum. Such is the process producing Fenianism. As long as these are the conditions of the life of the great mass of the Irish people, it is absurd to expect any other result. They would be more or less than human, if they could be content as they are. The conditions of life in the country into which they naturally escape, and with which their communication is most intimate, are such as in every way to heighten and strengthen their discontent. When England abolishes the Irish Church Establishment, she will do a wise and a just thing, and she will have the reward which is proper to justice and wisdom. But in the vast mass of political and social wrong and discontent, of which Fenianism is the organized outcome, the Church Establishment is a very insignificant item. If the Catholic Church had been established in its place a hundred years ago, we know no reason, therefore, why Fenianism might not be as widely-spread and as dangerous to-day—unless it be, indeed, that in that case the Catholic Church in Ireland would have probably attempted the conversion of the Irish Protestant gentry and so gradually united them on the six days of the week as well as on the seventh, in heart and interest with the people—in which case a more humane and tolerable social polity might probably have grown up between them, instead of that in which the landlord looks upon the priest as his natural enemy, and the tenant as his natural spoil. At present the English Government has the zealous and active aid of the Irish Catholic clergy in opposing



the action of the Revolution in Ireland; but we are not certain that the efficacy of their action would be increased, if they were to confront their people in the new character of pensioners of the State. Nor do we believe that there is any desire on the part of the Catholic hierarchy and clergy for any adjustment of their relations with the State, that should precede that large revision of the laws regulating the tenure of land, which they universally feel to be absolutely necessary as the primary condition of the pacification of the country.

On this subject, it is remarkable to observe that English opinion is fast travelling far in advance of the largest demands ever made on behalf of the tenantry in the most sanguine moments of the agitation of the Tenant League. The League never urged the purchase of the properties of absentee landlords by the State, and their sale at easy rates to the occupying tenants—a course, which, if commenced on absentee properties, must inevitably be extended to all others. For it would be impossible to maintain a system of rack-rented estates covered by tenants at will alongside of these numerous colonies of independent peasant proprietors. An idea, which appears to find favour among an advanced and very influential school of political writers, and which is infinitely more simple, complete, and just, is the application to Ireland of the law of permanent settlement, introduced in Bengal by Lord Cornwallis. Another plan proposed is the summary conversion of all the Irish tenures into copyhold. And there seems to be very little doubt that if the Irish farmers were with anything like unanimity to demand such a settlement and show their determination to enforce it by all legal means, English opinion, which is tolerant even of the excesses of Sheffield Trades Unions, might be glad to find this great difficulty brought to a crisis, such that the imperial authority must effect a permanent solution of a question, which has been too long the plaything of party to the damage of the State. But while we regard such alternatives, and contemplate the whole dismal conditions and prospects of Ireland at present, how wonderful seems the blindness of the Governments, and the obstinacy of the landlords, who refused in 1852 the good and moderate arrangement proposed by Mr. Sharman Crawford and the Tenant League! Who can doubt, if that measure had been enacted then, how very different the state of the country, how very much better the position of the landlords even, would now be! An immense tenant right property would already have been created throughout Ireland. Millions of money hoarded at low rates in the banks, or carried away to America or Australia, would have been productively sunk in

the soil. Emigration would doubtless have gone on, but the emigrant would not have carried away with him the peculiar bitterness, of which Fenianism is the product—he would have left the old homestead in Munster not less secure under the sanction of the law than that which he proposed to found amid the woods of Illinois. Ireland to his memory would wear the aspect, not of unrewarded labour and servile dependence, of base politics and state neglect,—but of a homely happiness and a modest prosperity, pleasant to dwell upon amid the restless movement and stern materialism of American life.

With the experience of these fifteen years—and no one has had ampler opportunities of observation—it is marvellous to find so accomplished and so high-minded a nobleman as Lord Dufferin devoting himself to the task of defending the Irish landlords as, perhaps, all things considered, the greatest benefactors of their country, and declaring that there is hardly any necessity for further legislation, or at least for any very large or liberal legislation, on this subject. To any concession on the point of tenure Lord Dufferin is absolutely averse. He believes that the tenantry don't even wish to have leases—which may be true of Ulster, where the tenant-right of the province provides an indefinite fixity of tenure, and which may be true also in some parts of the South, where the rules of certain estates, giving arbitrary powers to the agent, are embodied in them. But surely, the one great grievance of the Irish tenantry, as a class, is that they are tenants-at-will. Surely there can be no doubt that if they were all polled on the point, their demand would be a fixed tenure at a fixed rent. It may be impolitic, it may be impossible, to concede the demand, but assuredly there is evidence of a very general feeling in its favour; and we trust it is not necessary in these days to argue, as if *de novo*, that the great evil of the Irish tenant's state is its insecurity, that the exercise of their industry is insecure, that their possession of what property they have is insecure; that, unlike every other agricultural race on the surface of the globe, they are not authentically rooted in their own soil, but are only permitted such partial use and access to it as may suit the caprice and interest of a class, the majority of which is hostile to them on account of their religion and on account of their race.

Lord Dufferin, though averse to any legislation on the subject of tenure that would interfere with the existing freedom of contract, has no objection to the alteration of that presumption of law which has hitherto enabled the Irish landlords throughout three of the four provinces to confiscate the property of the tenantry. "Instead," he says, "of attempt-

ing to regulate the relation of the two parties, by the ambiguous provisions of a fictitious lease" (why an Irish landlord must necessarily make a fictitious lease will perhaps puzzle Lord Dufferin's English readers; and the phrase certainly seems to us an involuntary condemnation of his general argument), "it would be simpler to reverse the existing presumption of the law, that whatever is affixed to the soil belongs to the landlord, and to declare instead that any *bonâ fide* improvement executed by a tenant, outside of a written contract, is the property of the tenant, for which, on surrendering possession of the farm, whether of his own accord or under compulsion, he shall be entitled to receive compensation from his landlord to the amount of the additional value annually accruing from it, to be assessed by arbitration or recovered by a court of law."

This is substantially the main principle of the bill introduced by the late Government. The bill of the present Government proposes instead to lend the money of the State for the purpose of enabling the tenantry to establish a new class of property, with or without the consent of the landlord. In either case, it seems to us the old theory of landed property is proposed to be set aside. What greater objection in principle can there be to forcing the landlord to grant a lease at a fixed rent than there would be in forcing him to recognize a class of property created on his estate without his consent, whether with or without Government money? We regretted at the time that the bill of the late Government was not permitted to pass by the Irish Tories. We regret now that the bill of the present Government will not be permitted to pass by the Irish Liberals. This is a question, Parliament may feel well assured, in which the longer legislation is delayed, the worse for the landlords; and it needs little foresight to calculate that the next serious proposal to deal with this question will go as far beyond anything yet laid on the table of Parliament as the Reform Bill of the present year is in advance of the Reform Bill of 1859, or even the Reform Bill of 1865.

It is too probable, however, that no legislation will take place on the subject during the present Parliament; and it is not agreeable to contemplate the state in which Ireland may possibly be, by the time the writs are issued for the Reformed Parliament in 1869, if Fenian intrigues are to have two years' further full play without any beneficial intervention on the part of the legislature. If any other country in such circumstances were to be spoken of, it might be predicted that it would be ripe for revolution by that time. One revolution Ireland will pro-

bably be ripe for, after another such session as the present—a revolution, not to be regretted, in the character of its Parliamentary representatives. Exceptions there are, names which it would be idle or impertinent to suggest—but assuredly the general character of the Irish representation at present is its imbecility and servility. It may be doubted whether it has been so unequal to its responsibilities and opportunities at any time since the Union. There is a sort of indolent good-nature and a certain humourous charity in the general public opinion of the Irish nation on such matters; but when they are really roused, they react very rapidly and very ruthlessly against “humbug.” It may be remembered as a case in point, what a clean sweep they made in 1852 of the old Conciliation Hall Members of Parliament. We strongly suspect that the effect of an Irish Reform Bill will be to make the similar operation which must take place in 1859 only very much more clean and complete.

---

## Notices of Books.

---

*Civiltà Cattolica*, June 15, 1867. Rome.

**I**N this number of the *Civiltà* every single article bears directly or indirectly on the great festival at Rome, which will have reached its climax shortly before these lines meet our reader's eye.

By far the most noteworthy of these articles is the first; in which it is proposed that a special devotion shall be started to the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility apart from the Episcopate. The writer suggests the following formula :—

“ Oh blessed Prince of the Apostles, Saint Peter, I (N.N.), animated by the desire of offering to thee, and in thee to thy successors on the apostolic chair, a tribute of singular devotion, which on one side may compensate thee and the Church for the outrages committed against the Roman See, and on the other hand may engage me to honour it better, do vow to hold and to profess on every occasion, even at the price of my blood, the doctrine already most common among Catholics, which teaches that the Pope is infallible in defining authoritatively as Universal Teacher, *ex cathedrâ* as it is called, that which should be believed in the matter of faith or morals; and that therefore his dogmatical decrees are irreformable and bind in conscience, even before they have been followed by the Church's assent.

“ May it please thee, oh most glorious S. Peter, to offer in my name this vow to the Divine Founder of the Church, from whom came down in thee and thy successors all the prerogatives of the supreme Pontificate and supreme Magisterium; and obtain for me to be henceforth so devoted to thy Chair, and so docile to the authority of thy successors, that by my constant firmness in the faith, I may partake in the sovereign blessing of never erring in the path of salvation.”

The writer says, indeed, that he has no authority to assign any particular formula; and he presently adds: “ It will appear to more than one person that the object and matter of the vow are too restricted; since *duty and devotion towards the Holy See extend much further*. But treating as we are of a vow, the above, *for a time at least*, may appear sufficient.”

Considering the authority possessed by the *Civiltà*, there would seem to be no slight probability that this new devotion has received some kind of official sanction. Such a circumstance cannot but suggest the warmest hope that the Church is now actually on her way to a formal condemnation of Gallicanism. God grant we may live to see so blessed a consummation.

As we have been speaking in this notice of Roman matters, we will take the opportunity to place before our readers an address of the Pope in reply to the

congratulation of the bishops on the anniversary of his enthronement. We would particularly draw attention to the Pope's emphatic confirmation of the Syllabus :—

“I gladly accept all the good wishes and the aspirations which you have expressed. The present condition of society and the situation in which we find ourselves are such that if we had to count only upon our own strength, and on human aid, we could not do otherwise than abandon ourselves to grief, apprehension, and the most profound discouragement. The spread of false principles is upsetting all moral order ; and among these principles there are two which chiefly prevail, and which are used to promote the universal perturbation,—they are the pretended Progress, the alleged Unity, which are incessantly dwelt upon.

“The world is taught to believe that these two principles, applied to society, will restore to the earth the pristine felicity of Eden. But as in Eden human pride caused that fatal fault whose terrible effects are ever present, and must continue to be felt until the fulfilment of the ages, so, in the same manner, these principles, which have their origin in human pride alone, can produce only analogous and profoundly disastrous consequences. There can be no true Progress without religion and morality, and unity is sought in vain where impudent egotism reigns—where Christian charity has no longer a place.

“It is for me, it is for you—ministers of God, my co-operators ; it is for you, upright and pious souls, to combat the false principles which pervert the present generation, to dissipate the thick darkness which enwraps the world ; even as Moses conducted the elect people across the desert, under the ægis of a column of fire which lighted them in the night, and of a cloud which tempered the burning hours of the day. I have already raised my voice in an Encyclical which contains a series of condemned propositions known under the name of a Syllabus. I entirely confirm this Encyclical, and I renew it under these solemn circumstances. I lift my hands towards the Lord, and I implore Him to grant His grace and His aid to those who are fighting for the cause of His Church and His law. Do you all, in your turn, sustain my hands, so that they may not grow weary in the supplication which I address to God for the victory of His people ; even as the priests upon Mount Horeb held up the arms of Moses towards Heaven, and thus enabled him, by his prayers, to prolong the strife unto the setting of the sun, and so obtain for the Hebrews a glorious victory over their enemies.

“Let us pray, and let us hope. Yes, let us hope, with great confidence, that God will deign to grant to us—to me, His unworthy Vicar, and to you all, that we may behold the triumph of the Church, and the return of society to those principles whose abandonment has led to its present deplorable condition. Let us ask of God that He will keep His own chosen city free from moral and physical pestilence ; from the moral pestilence of those false principles which the enemies of religion are seeking to thrust upon us by every device of trickery or resource of violence ; from physical pestilence, by removing from it, in His infinite mercy, every material calamity.

“And that our aspirations and our prayers be promptly heard, I pray God to bless them. Oh, of a surety He will bless them, because they have no other aim than the exaltation of His Church. He will bless them, because they ask the extension of His reign upon earth, the sanctification of souls, the destruction of falsehood, and the return of society to His Church.”

Since the above was written, far more important intelligence has arrived, viz., that the Holy Father has announced his intention of convoking an Ecumenical Council. Considering the phenomena of the times and the



gravity of those questions which press for consideration, it is not improbable that there will have been no more momentous event in the whole history of the Church than this forthcoming Council.

The following is the passage of the Holy Father's allocution, delivered in the Consistory of the 26th of June, which makes this great and joyful announcement :—

“As for us, venerable brethren, nothing is more desirable than to receive from your union with this Holy Apostolic See fruit most salutary and most happy, which we now think it our duty to allow to spread over the whole Church. For a long time we have already contemplated a design, which has been made known to some of our venerable brethren, and which we hope to be able to put into execution as soon as we shall find the opportunity ardently desired by us. This design is to hold a Sacred Ecumenic and General Council of all the bishops of the Catholic world, where shall be sought, with the aid of God, in the union of counsels and of solitudes, the necessary and salutary remedies for those evils which afflict the Church. We have the greatest hope that, owing to this Council, the light of Catholic truth will shed its saving rays in the midst of the darkness which obscures souls, and will make them recognize, with the grace of God, the true path of salvation and of justice. At the same time the Church, like to an invincible army ranged in battle, will repulse the assaults of its enemies, will crush their efforts, and triumphing over them, will extend and propagate the reign of Jesus Christ on earth.”

---

*Die Encyclica Papst Pius IX. vom 8. Dezember, 1864. 1. Eine Vorfrage über die Verpflichtung. Von FLORIAN RIESS, S. J. Zweite Auflage. Freiburg, 1866.*

WE need hardly remind our readers how often we have returned lately to the task of examining the nature of the authority which attaches to the doctrinal instructions of the Holy See conveyed through such documents as Encyclical Letters. We have incurred much criticism, and even odium, by the fulfilment of what appeared and still appears to us the unavoidable duty of a Catholic Review at the present time. The chief burden of the criticism—the chief justification of the odium—has been that we have put forth, and sought to impose on others as essentials, personal idiosyncracies, crotchety exaggerations, extreme theories of our own.

In vain have we constantly protested that our one object was to ascertain and to inculcate simply what the Pope himself teaches on the subject. In vain have we declared that we advocated no private views, but only the teaching of approved theologians. In vain have we called attention to the labours of the Jesuit Fathers in the “*Civiltà Cattolica*,” formally approved and commended by the Holy Father. The cry has gained power by repetition, that the DUBLIN REVIEW holds on this subject singular and extravagant opinions, and represents them as essential. The misapprehension would be of comparatively small importance, if it affected only the contributors to this Review; but it strikes at the same time at what we believe to be the doctrine

of the Church, and the rightful authority of its head. We are particularly glad, therefore, of any pronouncement by theologians of name, not, of course, as adding any weight to the Pope's own utterances, but as a means of convincing our critics of their mistake in imagining the doctrine we have maintained to be a personal view or theory of our own.

It must be remembered that the precise question, unlike that of the Church's infallibility in minor censures, is necessarily a modern one; because it is only in recent Pontificates that the particular channel of Encyclical Letters has been chosen to any great extent for the purpose of conveying doctrinal instructions. Hence it is useless to seek for any direct treatment of it in older writers. Two theologians, however, of the greatest distinction have recently published treatises on the Church—Dr. Murray, theological professor at Maynooth, and F. Schrader, of the Society of Jesus, theological professor at Vienna. We called attention in our last number to their express treatment of this question, and their entire agreement with all that we have said upon it. We wish now to bring under the notice of our readers the teaching of another distinguished Jesuit. The work named at the head of this notice is not a scientific treatise; but a popular brochure of something more than a hundred pages, on the obligation laid upon the faithful by the "Encyclical and Syllabus" of 1864. It is the first of a series of pamphlets, by writers of the Society, on that great Pontifical act.

A few extracts will show how completely F. Riess's teaching coincides with our own language. To this purpose we shall confine our quotations.

"The Pope issued the Encyclical, not as a private person, but as head of the Church—as Vicar of Christ, to the whole Church; it binds, therefore, all the Church's members to submission. The Syllabus shares the same official character. . . .

"When the Pope speaks in his official capacity, he may address either particular individuals, or particular Churches, or the whole Church. The obligations arising from the document are to be ascertained from its contents" (p. 85).

"That the Encyclical was issued by the Pope in his official capacity, that it is addressed to the whole Church, and that it imposes an obligation on all her members," is "evident beyond a doubt from the very superscription, for it is a circular letter addressed to all the members of the Catholic hierarchy by Pius IX., as their head. . . . It is equally clear from the contents of the letter. The Pope pronounces his decision with an appeal to the teaching office divinely committed to him, and as the sequel to similar official acts. Moreover, he expressly obliges those to whom the letter is addressed to assent and obedience—bishops as well as faithful.

"We will and command that they (the pernicious opinions which he condemns) be considered by all the children of the Catholic Church as reprobated, proscribed, and condemned."

"Upon this point, therefore, no reasonable doubt is possible. The Pope issued the Encyclical as head of the Church, and it was his intention to enact a decree binding on the whole Church. Therefore, all the members of the Church are bound to submission" (pp. 85, 86).

But what sort of submission is this to be? The Pope may, as head of the Church, enact a disciplinary decree simply prohibiting to teach or maintain

this or that opinion ; such a decree would, of course, bind all the faithful to obedience, but its whole requirements would begin and end with an exterior submission. Are the decisions of the Quanta Cura of this nature. F. Riess answers this question.

“The Pope issued this Apostolic decree, not simply as spiritual head in general, but as the universal, infallible teacher of the Church ; so that it is not merely a disciplinary, but a doctrinal decree, and must be received by Catholics with the same submission which is due in all cases to the infallible utterances of the *Ecclesia Docens*.

“ . . . It is not merely an exposition of doctrine, which may be worthy of the greatest consideration without claiming the infallible authority of the Church’s teaching. That is to say, in both documents, as a glance at their doctrinal contents will show, erroneous teachings are condemned, and that, as the preamble of the decree expressly remarks, with the plenitude of Apostolic authority, and with the intention that the whole Church should reject them ; and they are condemned as errors contrary to the Church’s teaching. We have therefore before us an infallible judgment of the Church, and hence that which it proposes to us, namely, that the propositions selected and accurately drawn up, are errors against the Catholic teaching, is binding upon us, and *requires our interior assent on peril of our salvation*” (pp. 89–90).

“Even from the Gallican stand-point it would still be certain that the Pope’s decision (in the Quanta Cura) are decisions of the supreme teaching authority of the Church, and therefore infallible, . . . for the universal acceptance of the Encyclical by the bishops of Catholic Christendom . . . is now a fact. . . . Not a single bishop has raised his voice against the decision of the Holy See” (p. 93).

F. Riess’s proof for his conclusion is that—

“It is easy to see there are all the requirements for a judgment from the chair of Peter. The first, and *for Catholics properly sufficing one*, is the moral certainty that the Pope meant to bind the entire Church to receive his doctrinal decision. This intention is most clearly expressed both in the Encyclical and in the letter accompanying the Syllabus (p. 94).

F. Riess considers it clearly expressed by the fact that “The Holy Father appeals to his predecessors, who at all times have made it their chief aim ‘through their most prudent letters and decrees to expose and condemn all heresies and errors:’ treading in these glorious footsteps of his predecessors, Pius IX. has, from the commencement of his Pontificate, condemned the ‘principal errors of our time,’ and now sets himself once more ‘to extirpate other false opinions.’ So speaks the Pope to the Universal Church, to which he imparts his doctrinal decree, and invites, or, rather, requires it to conform to his decision ; and he himself says that he thus acts in the fulness of Apostolic authority. Whatever, therefore, this decree contains is the infallible teaching of the Church, and comes within *the province of faith*.” (*Ibid.*)

Whatever our critics may think as to F. Riess’s proofs and reasoning, they can hardly read the extracts that we have quoted, and doubt that our doctrine is identical with his. This has been the one scope of our notice. We trust it may at length make them hesitate to characterize our principles as singular opinions and personal crotchets.

We will conclude with a few sentences of F. Riess, which express a truth too little thought of in these discussions. Catholics sometimes speak or write about the infallible teaching of the Church as if it were a burden hard to bear, and hampered the freedom of their minds: and as if, accordingly their natural course was to limit and restrict its exercise within the narrowest possible bounds. F. Riess says, "Does this" surrender of our judgment "affect our freedom of conscience? Yes; but so as to promote and ennoble it. 'The Truth shall make you free.' Freedom of mind and conscience has its root, not in license to hold as true whatever I please; but in the inward discipline by which I submit my understanding to truth; just as the moral freedom of the will consists in doing cheerfully and willingly what we ought to do. God is the first Truth, the source of all Truth; what He reveals to us can be truth alone. He has revealed the Truth, and bequeathed it to us in the Catholic Church, and established her as the infallible teacher of His Truth. To submit to the Church when she proposes this truth to us for our belief is to submit our mind to God Himself, is to put ourselves in possession of truth, that is, to secure freedom of mind, freedom of conscience. . . . It is the great service of the Popedom to mankind that it assures this freedom, the freedom of our surrender of ourselves to Christ and to His ordinance both to individuals and to the human race, to all times and to the present time" (p. 109).

---

*When does the Church speak Infallibly? or, the Nature and Sphere of the Church's Teaching Office.* By THOMAS FRANCIS KNOX, of the Oratory. London: Burns & Oates. 1867.

WE are indebted to the courtesy of the author for the sheets of this pamphlet, which will probably appear simultaneously with our own issue. We exceedingly regret that they have reached us so late as to make it impossible to notice the work as we should desire, for its own sake and for the interest of the subject. We may, however, briefly mention that Father Knox treats, as his title indicates, the subject which has recently excited so much attention among Catholics; but he studiously avoids any allusion to the controversy which has taken place. He has come forward to supply a want which the discussion has partly revealed and partly created—by putting forth an uncontroversial and dispassionate statement of the Church's doctrine on the whole subject, as gathered from express declarations of the Holy See, and from the common teaching of approved theologians.

We have the deepest satisfaction in finding all the principles for which this REVIEW has been so long contending, now recommended to the acceptance of English Catholics by the weight and authority of the Superior of the London Oratory. Every fresh testimony contributes to prove that we have not been guilty of representing as the teaching of the Church a singular or personal opinion of our own:—but that is comparatively a small matter; the great gain is a fresh and powerful testimony to the fact of the Church's teaching.

Father Knox, as we have said, carefully avoids any reference to the recent controversy. We cannot, however, doubt that the pamphlet has been in fact called forth by it; and in this we have reason to rejoice at one good effect of Father Ryder's publication which we have all along augured from it; that it would lead to a careful examination of the subject, and result in the end in the firm establishment of the true doctrine in the minds of large numbers who had hitherto never reflected on the subject.

We need not say we earnestly hope Father Knox's pamphlet may be largely read; and we may add that no one need be deterred from reading it by fears of the abstruseness which has been attributed to the subject. Nothing can be more clear and simple than it is throughout; and the author takes care to state in his preface that his work is not meant as a theological treatise, but is expressly intended for the information of Catholic readers in general.

*Prose and Verse.* By the Rev. Dr. MURRAY, of Maynooth College. Dublin: M'Glashan.

DR. MURRAY'S letter on Confession, which constitutes the most important portion of this volume, is as seasonable now as it was at its first publication; and we hail with great satisfaction its renewed appearance. The Unionists of this day for the most part systematically ignore one prominent item among the many impassable barriers which separate the Establishment from the Catholic Church. Is confession of sins to a priest commanded by God, or is it not? If they say it is not, they fall under the direct anathema of Trent; and if they say it is, they must admit that their communion has apostatized from the Faith.\* Dr. Pusey, however, has consistently adhered to the former alternative; and while enlarging on the important advantages of Confession, has always denied its obligation. In what sense, however, he can harmonize this opinion with the Tridentine Decree, he has never explained.

His sermon on "the entire Absolution of the penitent" was that which gave occasion to Dr. Murray's letter. This sermon was intended primarily as a retractation, or at least an explanation, of certain severe statements he had put forth on the indelibility of post-Baptismal sin. In performing this task, he was led to enter more explicitly than he had ever entered before, on the doctrine concerning the divinely-appointed remedy for such sin; and the sermon presented his not unfrequent characteristics of fervent piety, inaccurate logic, confused history, and unsound theology. At the same time, as Dr. Murray points out, his tone was far less severe against Roman Catholics than it had been in his previous writings. It may, perhaps, be called the first number of Dr. Pusey's "new series";—of the series which has continued

\* See DUBLIN REVIEW for April, 1866, pp. 418-9.

from that date to the present, and which differs essentially from the earlier in its attitude towards Rome.

Nor was this nearer approach to Rome merely exhibited in its tone and temper. There was, as Dr. Murray points out (p. 4), a real approximation in doctrine also; a far more frank admission than he had hitherto made, that Christ has given to his Church the full power of absolving from sin. Still, however, he earnestly denied any divinely-given precept of Confession; and this is the point to which Dr. Murray directs his argument. We wish we had room for an analysis of the whole: but as this is impossible, we will draw our reader's special attention to the most critical part of all, viz., the *patristic* issue (pp. 19–29). Dr. Pusey had built an argument on certain passages of Tertullian and of S. Cyprian; but Dr. Murray shows triumphantly that both these Fathers testify, not the Anglican but the Roman doctrine.

Thus, Tertullian, in a most important passage, quoted at length by Dr. Murray (p. 20), speaks of “*exomologesis*,” the “second and only remaining repentance” to those who had sinned mortally after Baptism. Dr. Pusey holds that “*exomologesis*” means “a course of public penance;” and that Confession is mentioned, not as in itself commanded by God, but merely as necessary to the entering on this penitential course. Dr. Murray in reply (p. 21) admits that the word *was* sometimes—perhaps even more commonly—used to denote more than the mere confession of sin. But he proceeds triumphantly to insist that this use of the word strongly confirms Roman doctrine. Certainly, he argues, the literal meaning of the word is “Confession,” and nothing else. If it is used to denote the whole penitential course, this must be because Confession is the most important particular in that course. For in such tropes the name is always “taken from that part of the thing which is most prominent, or striking, or dignified, or essential.”

With equal force the author recites and comments on various passages from S. Cyprian, and replies on Dr. Pusey's attempt at explaining one of them away.

In an appendix (pp. 123–129) Dr. Murray answers an objection to Roman Catholic doctrine, which had been brought before his notice by a convert. “How many references there are in St. Paul to *peccatores fideles*! Yet in no one instance does he refer to their obligation of confessing. This is quite incredible if he knew of such an obligation.” His reply is hardly capable of abridgment, but is well worthy of most careful attention. In particular there are two “*argumenta ad homines*,” which will probably be new to our readers, and which possess irresistible cogency. (1) All Protestants will admit that *repentance* in some sense is necessary to the pardon of sins; yet “in all the places of his writings in which he speaks of sins or sinners, S. Paul does not even once speak clearly and distinctly of the duty of repentance, or exhort to it” (p. 128). (2) All Protestants will agree on “the special necessity and efficacy of *prayer* for obtaining the grace of repentance.” Now S. Paul, repeatedly as he mentions both sin and prayer, never once enforces this particular doctrine (p. 129.)

Dr. Murray has added other of his compositions, both in prose and verse, in order to make up a little volume. Of these the most noteworthy, we



think, is his very powerful philippic against M. Thouvenel ; which from its character will be found most attractive reading. There is one passage in page 91 on Papal infallibility to which we would specially direct attention ; it is in reference to the Pope's teaching on his civil sovereignty. As the Pope is infallible—such is in effect Dr. Murray's dictum (p. 91)—as supreme guardian of the Church's interests in the matter of *faith*, so is he also infallible as supreme guardian of her interests in the matter of freedom from undue influence. So, long afterwards, in the “*Quantâ cura*,” the Pope claimed infallibility for those judgements of his which “do not [directly] touch the dogmata of faith and morals,” but “whose object is declared [by him] to regard the Church's *rights, discipline, and general good*” (see April, 1865, p. 446). There is a striking similarity between Dr. Murray's exposition of doctrine and that which was at a later period infallibly promulgated by the Holy Father himself.

The sermon at the Month's Memory of Primate Crolly is published, “not as a specimen of pulpit eloquence,” we are told in its preface ; but it might very well be so published. It is remarkable for the simplicity, warmth, and earnestness of its style ; for its rare richness of Scriptural illustration, and the vivid picture it presents of its subject. Dr. Crolly was not a theologian, we take it, of the same views for which Dr. Murray is so eminently distinguished ; but he discharged the duties of a Catholic prelate in very difficult circumstances, in the centre of Ulster, in a most angry period of time, with signal courage and charity ; and his diocese bears many splendid monuments of his zeal.

An article on Mr. Dickens's “*Pictures from Italy*,” a work which was a conspicuous failure, is a model of acute and dignified criticism. The distinguished novelist, whose knowledge of even the merest, tritest historical associations connected with Italy was so limited that of “*Genoa la Superba*” he found nothing wiser or wittier to say than that its palaces were so many pink jails, naturally addressed himself to please the public by ridiculing the religion of the Italians, of which he was quite as ignorant as of their history. Dr. Murray exposes this ignorance as completely as he rebukes it temperately, compressing into the compass of a short article an amount of real knowledge which would suffice for half a dozen of the *soi-disant* instructors of modern society in the history, the art, and the religion of Italy.

All Dr. Murray's verses are finely conceived and finished ; and not a few have the real innate glow of true poetry. The lines on Glandore, for example, are full of light and music, and contrast admirably with the tender melancholy of those on the Rock of Cashel, which immediately follow them, and of which we may cite a few verses :—

“ Oh for one hour, a thousand years ago,  
 Within thy precincts dim,  
 To hear the chant in deep and measur'd flow  
 Of psalmody and hymn !

To see of priests the long and white array,  
 Around thy silver shrines ;  
 The people kneeling prostrate far away,  
 In long and chequer'd lines.

To see the Prince of Cashel o'er the rest,  
 Their prelate and their king,  
 The sacred bread and chalice by him blest,  
 Earth's holiest offering.

To hear in piety's own Celtic tongue,  
 The most heart-touching prayer,  
 That fervent suppliants e'er was heard among,  
 Oh, to be then and there !”

But there are sterner tones in Dr. Murray's lyre, as witness his chant for the kings of Prussia and Sardinia, last year :—

“ About justice and virtue and right,  
 Theology babbles and slobbers,  
 Ours is the virtue of right,  
 The right and the justice of robbers.  
 \* \* \* \* \*

Then on for the hell-inspired war,  
 With its infinite issues of evil,  
 Under the great guiding star  
 That flames in the eye of the devil.”

Those of our readers who have shared our interest in Dr. Murray's *magnum opus*, the great treatise “ De Ecclesiâ,” will read with sympathy the touching lines on “ The Close of a Long Task,” which immediately follow this racy stave of the robber kings.

---

*Christian Schools and Scholars ; or, Sketches of Education from the Christian Era to the Council of Trent.* By the Author of “ The Three Chancellors,” &c. 2 Volumes. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1867.

THIS work comes to hand just as we are finishing the corrections of the press of our current number. We have therefore now neither space nor time for a review of it. We promise ourselves, however, to attract to it all the attention we can by making it the subject of an article in a future number.

We may say here that it is from the gifted pen of the author of “ The Three Chancellors ” ; that it is an image carved out of the vast quarry of History, of the education which was obtainable within the pale of Christianity down to the Council of Trent ; that it bears on it the evidences of wide, diversified, and careful reading ; that it is at the same time rendered amusing by apposite anecdotes which are scattered throughout the two volumes ; and that it is impregnated with a deep and clear Catholic spirit.

*Usque ad nauseam*, the English and American people have talked and written about education during the last twenty years ; *usque ad nauseam*, we say, not because we do not deem education to be the question of the day, upon which our future depends more than upon anything else ; but because it has been a theme hacknied, in season and out of season, by every

kind of hand, and rarely founded upon the only admissible, true Catholic basis.

It is singular that nothing should have been attempted till now to supply the want which has underlain nearly all that has been written of late about education ; and it is gratifying to be able to affirm that the attempt has now been made by so conscientious and religious an investigator of history as our present author.

A boon and a service have been hereby rendered to the whole nation, by supplying to those who study the question of education, the missing basis and fulcrum of Christian practice and experience. For the Catholics of this kingdom there is a special service of opportuneness in the present publication of "Christian Schools and Scholars." For we are deeply intent upon the improvement of our higher studies ; we are anxious and determined on providing an university education, but such an university education as shall be neither Protestant nor rationalistic, neither latitudinarian nor nondescript, but of the true and tried Christian temper. Again, the formation of ecclesiastical seminaries naturally preoccupies the attention of many, and is, according to our estimate and belief, the most vital and pregnant of all our educational questions.

All persons interested, however superficially, in these topics, will do well to peruse the two volumes which lie before us. It is a part of true Christian wisdom to form our theories and to test our views by the accumulated experience of centuries of Christian tradition. What is the notable advantage which we possess over those who have gone before us ? Surely it is this,—our knowledge, from their experience, of the difficulties which as thorns beset their path, and, as lions, infested their way. A great road of light, described in the volumes we are noticing, has been opened out by the Church through the centuries, in the midst of the world. At one extremity of it, as on the mountain, stand our Blessed Lord and his Apostles, the beginning and the source of this way of light, its unerring truth. To us they are clearly visible, with their principles and maxims, as they were to our predecessors, through the presence in our midst of Christ's Vicar and his brethren. History tells us of the difficulties through which the road was frayed, of the assaults of the devil, the world, and the flesh, of the defeats and victories of grace and faith. It adds to our knowledge : it adds also to our responsibilities ; for while we pick and choose, we have a double light, the one divine, the other the experience of past ages. It ought therefore to be easier for us "to act up to that which is shown us on the mountain," than for those who were warned and forearmed by a shorter experience than we possess. We are not entering at present into a criticism or examination of the work before us, but we may be permitted to direct the thoughts of our readers by one short extract from it :—

"The public schools of the Empire were not generally resorted to by the faithful until after the conversion of Constantine, when Christians were permitted to aspire to the professor's chair. . . . It is a significant fact that long after the establishment of a nominal Christianity in the institutions of the Empire, the saint whose children were destined to hold in their hands the future education of Europe, is introduced to us in the first incident of

his life, flying into the wilderness to escape the corruption of the semi-pagan schools of Rome. S. Augustine has told us something of the condition of the schools of Carthage in his time, which may probably be taken as a fair specimen of the state gymnasia in other parts of Europe. . . . Their professors, S. Augustine remarks, would have treated it as a greater fault to pronounce *homo* without the aspirate than to hate a man. Many were pagans, like Libanius, the master of S. Chrysostom; others were content with the smallest possible seasoning of Christianity. . . . Honourable exceptions of course were to be found . . . but as a general rule the professors troubled themselves very little about questions of faith or ethics. . . . New comers were laid violent hands on by the scholastic jackals . . . thus it was they prepared to seize S. Basil on his first coming to Athens, when S. Gregory of Nazianzen interfered to protect him. . . . S. Gregory does not forget to inform us that it was as difficult for a youth to preserve his innocence in the midst of such an atmosphere as it would be for an animal to live in the midst of fire, or for a river to preserve its sweetness when flowing through the briny ocean" (p. 20, vol. i.)

Human nature remains the same, and history repeats itself.

---

*The Life of S. Aloysius Gonzaga, of the Company of Jesus.* Library of Religious Biography. Edited by EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON. Burns & Oates.

WE gladly hail the first instalment of Mr. Healy Thompson's *Library of Religious Biography*.

There are few more hopeful signs of our time than the growing interest in the lives of saints and saintly persons. The commencement of the Oratorian series by Father Faber was, it will be remembered, accounted by many a doubtful and even dangerous experiment. Few will now deny that its publication was one of the most valuable services rendered by him to the Church in this country; but excellently as that series has fulfilled the intentions of its lamented editor, a want is still felt of biographies of a more popular kind, which may attract and fix the attention of readers, who are often repelled by the monotonous repetition of panegyric pervading many of the originals of the Oratorian translations, and still more by the indifferent execution of some of them. Several shorter lives of a more popular kind have already appeared; among the best of which we should place a translation of the life of S. Anthony of Padua, by F. Gervais Dirks, a Belgian Recollect Father.

The present life of S. Aloysius is to be followed by a series, the chief object of which is to present examples of high Christian perfection amidst the perils and distractions of secular life, whether the subject of the biography has been detained in the world by the absence of the vocation to religion, or by inability to carry out his desire to enter the religious state. The examples of this series are to be selected, the editor tells us, chiefly, though not exclusively, from the uncanonized servants of God. He protests strongly against the idea that high sanctity is restricted to such as have been set

forth by the Church for the public veneration of the faithful, and that saintliness is to be "railed in as something separated from us by rule and line in a region by itself." The lives are to be selected from the great number of saintly and quasi-saintly characters which have illustrated the last three centuries, some canonized servant of God being introduced from time to time "to strike, as it were, the key-note in that celestial harmony to which the rest at their several intervals in the scale accord."

S. Aloysius has been chosen to open the series, "not only from the desire to commend the undertaking to his special patronage, and of increasing amongst ourselves a devotion which has been observed to have peculiar practical effects in the hearts of those who cultivate it; but because, along with his heroic mortifications, his wonderful gift of prayer, and all those singular and surpassing graces with which God so profusely adorned him, and to which we may not aspire—he exhibits in the most striking form holiness battling with hostile influences in the world—and because, whether in the world or in religion, he offers so splendid an example of the most perfect fulfilment of the lowly and unpretending virtues, the performance of ordinary actions with extraordinary exactness and completeness,—which perfection, whilst it is, perhaps, the surest touchstone of sanctity, comes also more readily within the sphere of our imitation—being in kind what all may aim at, although in degree they cannot hope to reach it."

The life before us brings out strongly a characteristic of the Saint which is, perhaps, little appreciated by many who have been attracted to him chiefly by the purity and early holiness which have made him the chosen patron of the young. This characteristic is his intense energy of will, which reminds us of another Saint, of a very different vocation and destiny, whom he is said to have resembled also in personal appearance—the great S. Charles Borromeo. We have seldom been more struck than in reading this record of his life with the omnipotence of the human will when united with the will of God. When a boy of fourteen, in the brilliant and perilous position of page of honour to the son of Philip II. of Spain, he made the resolution to make daily an hour of consecutive mental prayer without *a moment's distraction*. If after half or even three quarters of an hour, his thoughts wandered for an instant, he began his meditations again. Sometimes he had to make five hours' prayer or more before he succeeded. But he succeeded at last, and won by this heroic perseverance such a mastery over his exterior and interior faculties as to be enabled thenceforth to fix his attention upon such subjects alone as he wished to consider. He acquired the power (as he himself afterwards acknowledged) of thinking or not thinking of whatever he pleased. A perfection of disengagement, which could not have been exceeded by that of S. Simeon Stylites at the end of his marvellous abode in the desert, was thus early granted to the faithful, persevering efforts of a boy dwelling in the very heart and focus of the world's fiercest temptations.

Mr. Thompson has grounded his biography upon the recent edition of Cepari's Life of S. Aloysius, published by the Jesuit Fathers at Rome. Cepari lived in close intimacy with the Saint at the Roman College. Reference also has been made to the processes instituted by Apostolical authority in the year 1608, under the Pontificate of Paul V.

*Christendom's Divisions, Part II. Greeks and Latins.* Being a full and connected history of their dissensions and overtures for peace down to the Reformation. By EDMUND S. FFOULKES, formerly Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College, Oxford. London: Longman, 1867.

**T**HE second part of an elaborate attack on the Catholic Church, more strange and perverse even than the first. We might use stronger language, but our readers shall judge once more between Mr. Ffoulkes and ourselves. The book is advertised under the heading, "Justice to Greece ;" not altogether inappropriately, as certain men understand justice, but the "justice" here meant is injustice to the Church, and specially to the Sovereign Pontiffs.

Having said that the "elevation" of Photius to the See of Constantinople "was irregular but unpremeditated," Mr. Ffoulkes writes as follows, p. 5:—

"Ignatius, the Constantinopolitan patriarch, had offended the Emperor Michael, had been turned out by him, and supplanted by Photius. As he protested against the unjust treatment to which he had been subjected, Michael and Photius appealed to Rome, and Nicholas, in perfect conformity with the course prescribed in the Sardican canons, despatched the bishops of Porto and Anagni as his legates to Constantinople, to try the cause there."

Now if Mr. Ffoulkes admits that Ignatius was "supplanted" by Photius, he must have been careless when he said that the elevation of that hypocrite was "unpremeditated." Again, the "turning out" of Ignatius is not fairly described as being the result of an offence to the boy Michael, who was emperor at the time. The real "offence" of Ignatius was his public refusal of communion, on the feast of the Epiphany, to the prime minister Bardas, the emperor's uncle. That unprincipled man was living openly in adultery and incest, had disregarded the monitions of the patriarch, and presented himself in a state of notorious impenitence among the communicants. Bardas, to avenge himself on the patriarch, told lies of him, by fraud and violence expelled him from the city, and put Photius in his place.

Mr. Ffoulkes says Ignatius "protested" and "Michael and Photius appealed to Rome." Now no doubt the deposed patriarch did "protest," but to no purpose, for he was in prison and carefully guarded, unable to complain to any one but his jailers, and they were not the men either to sympathize with him or to help him. As for the "appeal" to Rome, we never heard of it before. Why should Photius appeal? he had nothing to appeal against. It is true he wrote to the Pope, but it was to announce his election; and in his letter he told him a falsehood, for he said that Ignatius had abandoned his see (*ὑπεξελθόντος*), which he knew was not the case, only he hoped the Pope might never know it.

We pass over the reference to the Sardican canons, and ask Mr. Ffoulkes to tell us on what authority he says that the legates of the Pope were to "try the cause." Most certainly they never were empowered to "try" anything; they were to make inquiry only, and report to the Pope, without



judging anything themselves. They were, moreover, commanded to treat Photius not as an ecclesiastic but as a layman, and the Pope, besides, had written himself to Photius in the same sense. The Pope refused from the first to recognize him in his ecclesiastical character.

Of Photius we read thus (the italics are ours) :—

“ He can never cease to command respect in the world of letters ; and some day, possibly, *his reputation as a theologian* will be much more generally allowed.

“ As a man, as bishop of the second see in the world, his character was by no means free from blemish, *if half the stories told of him are true*” (p. 60).

“ Photius, who appears before us in the character of a peacemaker, a character evidently more congenial to him than that of belligerent, and in which he came out originally *till he was forced to assume the other*, though it would be difficult to say in which he excelled most. Polite, refined, full of learning and orthodox sentiments, thoroughly familiar with the history of those to whom he was writing—*the antipodes of Benedict XII. in this respect*—he had . . .” (p. 498).

“ Photius always represents his doctrinal differences as having been *with a party*, not with Rome, which is strictly true” (p. 15). [Here the italics are those of Mr. Ffoulkes.]

Now Photius denied the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, and Mr. Ffoulkes says in effect that Rome did not hold that doctrine ; and there are passages in the book which make it very doubtful whether he himself is a very hearty believer in it. These are his words ; and the italics too are his in the first part, but the last are ours :—

“ As it is, who can deny that the doctrine of the *original* procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father has been imperilled by including it in the same proposition with His *derivative* procession, however eternal, [!] from the Son. . . . On the other hand, suppose the change had run, “ Who proceedeth from the Father, Who, by gift of the Father, proceedeth equally from the Son, and is sent by the Son,” *would not the doctrine of the double procession* have been expressed with *greater accuracy*, without disturbing any of the old landmarks, without the apparent irreverence of adding to words spoken by our Lord Himself ?” (pp. 551, 552.)

We know of no words wherewith to describe this. The marvel is how Mr. Ffoulkes contrives to be numbered among Catholics. He quarrels with the definitions of the faith, and charges the Holy See with “apparent irreverence.”

In another place he gives us an argument of Photius against the Catholic doctrine on the procession, which he considers unanswered or unanswerable ; namely ; that—

“ Neither in the creeds of the Œcumenical Councils, nor in any text of Scripture, is there any direct statement of procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, while there is of procession from the Father in each case” (p. 416).

Mr. Ffoulkes is not satisfied with the reply of S. Thomas, that the procession from the Son is held implicitly by those who really believe the procession from the Father, nor is he frightened by the Protestant principle laid down by Photius. If that argument is worth anything, it will overthrow many

doctrines of the Faith ; and if anybody had invented it before the Council of Nice, it would have been of good use to the Arians.

The doctrine of the procession from Father and Son is naturally distasteful to a Photian, but we are surprised to hear that "the earliest explicit declaration on record of that doctrine" (p. 67) is to be found in the history of the Council of Toledo, A.D. 589. We were not prepared for this, because S. Leo the Great is commonly quoted as having expressed the doctrine in the usual terms in his letter to the Bishop of Astorga. *Qui de Utroque processit*. The Spanish converts from Arianism were no doubt "called upon to anathematize" their heresy, but it was reserved for Mr. Ffoulkes to say that they invented a new doctrine in their new fervour. The Spanish converts and Charlemagne are represented by him as the authors of a doctrine which the Holy See always held, and which Pope Leo III. sent to the monks of Mount Olivet, "Ut tam vos quam *omnis mundus* secundum Romanam sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam rectam et inviolatam teneatis fidem," and this faith included the procession, "*a Patre et Filio procedens*." But Mr. Ffoulkes, carefully forgetting the equally explicit teaching of S. Leo the Great, says that "this was the strongest and most explicit declaration that had emanated from any Pope hitherto in favour of the views prevalent in the West on the Procession" (p. 72).

He is much troubled by "the pseudo-decretals," but he treats as genuine the Caroline books, and gives us, so far as we can see, no hint that learned men have not always regarded them as authentic. They are at least suspicious, and their authority is not so high as to defy resistance. But they are useful to our author, who thus speaks :—

"Charlemagne decreed both the interpolation *and the doctrine* upon false premises. . . . His assertion, which has beguiled so many since then [among others S. Thomas], was that all those who affirmed the single were believers in the double procession in the same sense" (p. 551).

This is surely to say, against all evidence, that the doctrine of the "Filioque" was forced on the Church by Charlemagne about the beginning of the ninth century.

"For a thousand years in round numbers the Latin Church has been committed to the theological *ipse dixit* of a secular aristocrat" (p. 548).

Who "never acknowledged his error. And so completely did he manage to indoctrinate the Latin Church with his thesis that" . . . . (p. 589).

Mr. Ffoulkes attributes to the Latin doctors either ignorance or bad faith. They have mis-translated a word in S. Cyril ; that is, turned *profluit* into *procedit*. This iniquity Alcuin "was the first to originate" (note to p. 394). "The work on the procession attributed to Alcuin is, perhaps, the earliest instance of a similar assertion" (p. 406), namely, that the double procession was defined at Ephesus and Constantinople. Now, as to *profluit* : that is the wrong word which Alcuin uses (De Process. Sp. S. Cpp. i., p. 748) ; and, as to the other charge, that he may have been the first to quote the Councils of Ephesus and Constantinople for his purpose, we have to say that more than a hundred years before the Council of Frankfort, and long before Alcuin and

Charlemagne were born, Theodore, the Greek Archbishop of Canterbury, who had been tonsured according to the Oriental rite, and therefore educated not in the Western learning, makes the very same assertion. As he was a man of great learning, and knew Greek, we may fairly trust him about the two councils in question. He held a synod of the Saxon prelates A.D. 680, wherein the five general councils were received, and among them Ephesus and Constantinople, together with another council not long before held in Rome. The assembled prelates confessed the Holy Ghost *procedentem ex Patre et Filio inenarrabiliter, sicut prædicaverunt hi, quos memoravimus supra, sancti Apostoli et prophetæ et doctores*. This they said was the Catholic Faith.—Bedæ, Hist. Eccles. IV. c. 17, Ed. Stevenson.

Nicholas I. was a man “full of grandeur throughout . . . never once tarnished by sordid or unworthy aims” (p. 61). But, nevertheless, it is thus written of him :—

“Nicholas I., indeed, asserts the contrary, but he is contradicted by what took place in his own pontificate.”

“The pity is that he should not have distinguished them accurately, derived as they were from such different sources, or contended for one while enforcing the other” (p. 45).

“What he says of the patriarchate of Constantinople is not untrue absolutely, but untrue by suppression” (p. 51).

“Nicholas was here straining a point against a rival, and arguing as one patriarch against another” (p. 11).

Pope Eugenius is treated in the same way. The admiral of the Pontifical galleys sent by him to carry the deputies of the Greeks with their emperor to Florence, is reported to have said that he was “commissioned to burn, sink, and destroy the galleys of the council [of Basle] wherever he might encounter them.” This statement is made by Mr. Ffoulkes on the authority of Syropulus, a miserable Greek whom even Oudin shrinks from believing, and whom F. Michæl of S. Joseph describes as *Scriptor Græcus Græcæque fidei*. He subscribed the decree of union at Florence, and apostatized as soon as he got home ; where he wrote the wretched book from which Gibbon and Dr. Milman and Mr. Ffoulkes quote. But it is not so much for the sake of Syropulus that we refer to this, as to the gratuitous attack on the Pope :—

“The written commission given to Condolmieri is not of course explicit” p. 334, note).

That “written commission” seems to have been looked at, at least by Mr. Ffoulkes ; and we ask him to produce a word from it which can be construed into anything like the threat of the admiral. Whether the admiral ever made that threat or not, is more than we can tell ; but most certainly we are not going to admit it on the authority of Syropulus. The insinuation against the honour of the Pope is perfectly without foundation.

There is a charge of literary dishonesty also brought against the same Pope. In the Decree of the Union of the Armenians, Eugenius recited a compendious account of the Sacraments which S. Thomas is said to have written ; of this Mr. Ffoulkes says :—

“A long instruction taken from his treatise [S. Thomas] on the Sacraments, though Eugenius *delivers it to them as his own*” (p. 468).

Now, the Pope does not say that the compendium is his own ; he gives the Armenians the necessary instruction in a formula ; it need not be his own : the words are, *sub hâc brevissimâ redigimus formulâ* ; not *in hanc redigimus formulam*. The Pope might have taken the public catechism and inserted it in the decree, without varying the words : *sub hâc brevissima redigimus formulâ*.

Still more, Mr. Ffoulkes was too hasty in adopting his interpretation of the marginal note in Coleti. The writer of that note says, *desumpta sunt* ; that is, taken out of, not adopted ; and if anybody will take the trouble to compare the Decree of the Pope with the opuscle of S. Thomas, he will see that the Pope has left out more than he borrowed. Besides, we are not sure that other tracts on the Sacrament may not be found, out of which the Pope might have copied the like words.

But Mr. Ffoulkes, thinking he has caught the Pope, says that, in virtue of this decree,

“The Armenians were bound by the teaching of S. Thomas on the Sacraments, which, it is needless to say, not only the Greeks but the Latins themselves were not” (p. 538).

The Armenians were bound by the teaching of the Pope ; and S. Thomas is not mentioned in the decree. They might accept the Scotist theology if they liked, including even the Franciscan definition of the Sacraments, for anything contained in the Papal Instruction.

Here is something still more singular :—

“Now and then, indeed, Eugenius is for diluting or improving upon S. Thomas.” (pp. 538, 539).

Is not the Pope the teacher of the Church ; and why should it be insinuated of him that he is bound by S. Thomas or any one else ?

“For the contents of the chalice, ‘wine of the grape mixed with water in *small* quantity,’ says S. Thomas : Eugenius, ‘wine of the grape should be mixed with water in the *smallest* quantity’” (p. 539).

Now in S. Thomas we read, *vinum de vite modicâ aquâ permistum*, and in the Decree, *vinum de vite cui ante consecrationem aqua modicissima admisceri debet* ; and further on, where the Pope decrees, *decernimus*, he bids the Armenians use *paululum aquæ* ; and if that is very different from *modica aqua*, Mr. Ffoulkes is welcome to it. But after all, it remains to be proved that the Pope was quoting S. Thomas at all.

“The authorities adduced by him [the Pope] are the first of the three pseudo-decretals of Alexander . . . and another of Julius. . . . On such evidence he calls upon the Armenians to believe the use of the mixed chalice was imperative” (p. 539).

After all this we can scarcely be surprised when we read as follows :—

“One might almost say of him [Eugenius] that he had demoralized the whole race of ecclesiastical historians and biographers, for the time being, to call

evil good and good evil ! Wonder of wonders it would have been, indeed, had the peace of Christendom been achieved under his auspices. War, not peace, was his congenial element " (p. 371).

Eugenius, at Florence, asked the Greeks to elect a patriarch, and offered to remove the Latin patriarch if they did so : for he would give them no excuse for returning into heresy and schism. This is the comment of Mr. Ffoulkes :—

" Scandalous propositions, indeed, both of them, to have emanated from the head of the Church. The Greeks, according to his own showing, had been 450 years estranged from unity ; on the octave of their return to it, he, the head of the Church, is found inciting them deliberately to a breach of the canons " (p. 364).

Does Mr. Ffoulkes know what the Papacy means ?

Of the Vicars of Christ generally this is said :—

" On the other hand, it is impossible to deny that the Popes have been swayed, not merely by the fluctuations, but by the mistakes and inaccuracies of their theologians, on what may be called matters of fact ; they have not been proof against the mistranslations, quotations from spurious doctrines, and historical mis-statements which, as we shall see, were bandied about in endless profusion on the Latin side " (pp. 405, 406).

" It is easy to acquit the Popes—as in the matter of the pseudo-decretals, so on the doctrine of the procession [of the Holy Ghost], *on the ground that they were taken in* themselves, misinformed, imposed or worked on by those to whom they looked for information—of any wilful injustice towards the Greeks, of any premeditated espousal of positions which they knew to be false. But it is by no means easy to acquit them of *culpable negligence*—by no means easy to deny that they must have acted without proper inquiry sometimes, *animated either by party-spirit or by a sheer love of dictation . . .*" (p. 589).

The Crusaders fall under the lash as well as the Popes.

" The Crusades themselves, so far, were the joint offspring of feudalism and Mohammedanism, and passed only by adoption into the Christian family . . . . It was in reality the Koran that supplied mediæval preachers with the text on which the Crusades were preached, and Mohammed whose sermon, and whose style was copied " (p. 94).

S. Bernard, it seems, preached from the Koran. But Mr. Ffoulkes will not let the Crusaders escape without showing how wicked they were, and how unprincipled the Popes who encouraged them. After quoting some Mahometan filth, he tells us that these " were the doctrines which pilgrims to the East brought back with them . . . to be . . . at length and unawares parodied in the indulgences of the Church " (p. 95). On this passage there is a long note quite as curious : after reciting a canon, he says, " This is certainly not due to the Koran. But, then, what are the comments on canon 2 of the Council of Clermont supplied by Mansi ? " This comment is in his eyes suspicious, and probably rank Mohammedanism. Well, Mansi is not the first to supply it, and it is moreover the comment of a " sound " Gallican, whom Mr. Ffoulkes speaks of with respect,—no other then De Marca himself.

At the end of the note Mr. Ffoulkes says,—and the italics are his, not ours,—“Not a word is said *here* of their good dispositions.” Now, the truth is, that the good dispositions are not only taken for granted as usual, but are here distinctly mentioned. The Pope calls upon all who could to take up arms against the enemies of God, and grants the indulgence, not to all who should go to the war, but to those who were *pœnitentes*. Now, how can a man repent without good dispositions? for a penitent without them is no penitent, and therefore incapable of deriving any spiritual advantage from the munificent indulgence of Urban II. If Mr. Ffoulkes had looked into the book out of which de Marca made the extract which he supplied as a comment for the canon, though the credit of that supply is given to Mansi, he would have seen that the first Crusaders were not altogether without a conscience. The passage immediately preceding that which De Marca quoted is to this effect: that instantly after the sermon of the Pope “thieves and pirates with other evil-doers, moved by the Spirit of God, rose again from the pit of iniquity, confessed their sins and forsook them,” and thus became qualified for gaining the indulgence of the Pope. Certainly the Crusaders knew, whatever else they did not know, that killing Saracens was not the whole duty of man.

Mr. Ffoulkes finds consolation in the fact that no Crusader, as such, ever attained to great honour in the Church.

“It is a glorious fact,” he says, “that . . . no Crusader, in the popular sense, has ever been admitted to canonization, as such, or had his sanctity measured by the number of those whom his sword slew” (p. 96).

Well, a man might have been a Crusader without slaying anybody, like Baldwin of Canterbury, or his successor Hubert; and it is possible enough that S. Louis never slew any one with his own hand. But we were not prepared to hear that a Crusader was necessarily so deficient in the heroic virtues. S. Bernard preached a Crusade, and S. Louis undertook it; both have been canonized; and as to the latter, his crusade was considered in his process, but it was no hinderance to his canonization; and is mentioned to his honour in the Bull which numbers him among the Saints.

Mr. Ffoulkes throughout his book is on the side of the enemies of Rome. The Latins are either rogues or fools, and the Greeks are the victims, whom the Church “atrociously treated.” The obstinate and pig-headed heretic Mark of Ephesus is “the brave old man,” and “the fine old Greek,” and the “hoary representative of the last surviving Apostle” (p. 595); as if S. John had ever been bishop of Ephesus.

Hitherto it was held that the Church is kept from heresy, because she listens to the voice of him and of those whom our Lord has appointed to teach her. But Mr. Ffoulkes has discovered that this is a delusion; for “the whole Church might have been committed, humanly speaking, to formal heresy during the middle ages, but for the Greeks . . . By their influence they have proved the saviours of Christendom” (*ib.*). The Greeks “are better friends to the Pope than his own party; better friends to the faith than those who dubbed them heretics” (p. 596). “They have been martyrs to Catholic and eternal truth” (p. 591).

Here is something more startling still if possible.



"The Roman Church, according to the teaching of the most magnificent of the mediæval Popes, is not called the Universal as being the Catholic, but Universal as being the dominant Church—in other words mother and mistress of all Churches ; and the Greek Church, according to the teaching of his successors, is *as much a part of the Catholic Church as the Latin, although separated for the time being from the Pope*" (p. 566).

Who is the Pope that teaches this? How is it to be reconciled with the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, wherein we read: "Subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ, declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronunciamus, omnino esse de necessitate salutis."

Our author seems to hold that people may come into the Church as members of a body without a personal conversion ; that is probably the reason why he fell into an error now to be exposed. John XXII. speaks of the Church of the Greeks as "cut off from the body of the Universal Church (*Universalis Ecclesiæ corpore mutilata*)," and hopes it might be brought back into the unity of the same body from which it had been severed ; *ad unionem ejusdem corporis*. But this would not do for Mr. Ffoulkes ; so he translates "to corporate reunion with it once more" (p. 292).

The following paragraph is so very serious, that we almost shrink from making the necessary comment on it.

"They [the Greek schismatics] have saved the whole Church from being amenable to the charge of professing its faith in a proposition of which the meaning is equivocal. They . . . have been perfectly right in maintaining that . . . the proceeding [of the Holy Ghost from Father and Son] however eternally, *cannot and ought never to have been attempted* to be expressed in a single proposition" (p. 592).

Mr. Ffoulkes therefore is of opinion that the clause "Qui ex Patre Filioque procedit" does not truly express Catholic doctrine, and ought never to have been used ; in other words, that the addition "Filioque" was neither reasonable nor lawful. But the Council of Florence expressly defined—and required assent to its definition as essential to Catholic communion—that the said words "were added to the Symbol lawfully and reasonably." Mr Ffoulkes rejects a proposition of which an Ecumenical Council required the acceptance as necessary for Catholic communion.

The Greeks are said to have been always the most docile subjects of the Pope, only they could not get the Pope to deal justly with them.

"They admitted his primacy, as their acts testify ; but they denied that he had any patriarchal or metropolitan rights over the East" (p. 554).

But when did the Pope call himself, or claim to be, merely the patriarch or metropolitan of the East? In another place we read—

"It is not asserted, nor would it have been true to assert, that the Greeks ever denied the primacy" (p. 565).

"That primacy was, on the contrary, never once disputed when party spirit was at its highest" (p. 45).

Well, S. Antoninus knew something of the matter, and he says that the Greeks were wrong on three points. The first was the doctrine about the Holy Ghost, and the second about purgatory. The third we shall give in his

own words : "Quòd Ecclesia Orientalis et Constantinopolitana non esset sub Ecclesiâ Romanâ, nec patriarcha Constantinopolitanus esset inferior Romano Pontifice." And the Saint ends by saying that all these three tenets were heretical : "Horum quodlibet est hæreticum."

What is the meaning of this ?

"The Pope during the Council [of Florence] offering to put the whole question to the vote, for the purpose of deciding, in the words of S. Antoninus, 'what points of Christian truth should be held or abandoned' " (p. 563).

It is repeated again, p. 579, but in p. 342 the portentous statement is assigned to the Greek Emperor, and the Pope there is said to have merely "assented." Even that is strange enough. But as it is something in the way of dirt to fling at the Pope, there is too much reason to think that Mr. Ffoulkes was too ready to put it up, and roll it into a ball, and hurl it. In its origin the matter is innocent enough, but by a little taste and manipulation it could be fashioned into a calumny ; and so it was.

S. Antoninus is made responsible for the story, and is represented besides as holding the opinion that certain "points of Christian truth" were to be "abandoned" if the majority wished it. The Greeks are innocent ; for we do not hear from their defender that they even accepted the offer. According to S. Antoninus—we are not able to consult the chronicle itself, but there is a long extract from it in Coleti's Councils, xviii. 1296, which we have no reason to mistrust, agreeing with the quotation made by Mr. Ffoulkes, who probably saw it where we see it—the proposal came from the Greek Emperor. But not precisely as it is described. The Emperor asked the Pope to hold a council, wherein doctors on both sides might discuss what is to be held or not touching Christian truth,—quid tenendum respiciendumve foret *de veritate Christiana*. The Pope assented,—to what ? To the council and the discussion ; that is all that can be made of it : and it is incorrect to say that he ever offered to put Christian truth to the vote, or that S. Antoninus ever imagined the object of the council to be anything of the kind.

The Council of Florence seems to be an offence to Mr. Ffoulkes, even though he makes the bishop of Rochester (p. 560) a member of it. There never was a bishop of Rochester called Andreas, and the Andreas of the council must have come from some other see. If Mr. Ffoulkes had been more careful, he would have ascertained from the Latin Acts that *Roffensis* is a mistake of the copyist. He is also hard upon Cardinal Julian, the most prominent member of the council, who

"A fugitive from the battle-fields, fell pierced by three arrows in the marshes between it and Shumla. This was the sequel to the Council of Florence, on the Latin side ; here Cardinal Julian paid the price of the decree he had read out, and of the means by which it had been obtained " (p. 372).

This is surely nothing less than to assert that the decree of Union was an offence to God, which He punished by the violent death of the Cardinal. Would Mr. Ffoulkes like us to tell him of the death of Mark of Ephesus, with its revolting details ? But as for the Cardinal, we have this to say

God rewarded him in his death a hundredfold, for he died a martyr. The Turkish commander offered him life and honours if he would deny the Faith: if he refused, horrible tortures. He was scourged till his skin was in stripes, and iron nails were driven into the quivering flesh. After a time the Turkish surgeons tempt him with life, and promise to heal his wounds. The noble martyr, not yet fifty years old, would not buy his life at the shameful price, and the scourge fell upon him once more till he was dead. If this was "the price of the decree," all we can say is that the decree must have been more than pleasing in the sight of God; and that Cardinal Julian must have gladly confessed that the payment was more than he had deserved, however much he may have desired it. May our soul be with his!

In pp. 481-491 Mr. Ffoulkes repeats some very singular statements on the Florentine definition, which he made in the *Union Review* for March, 1866. We replied to them fully at the time (April, 1866, pp. 550-555); but Mr. Ffoulkes does not seem aware of our comment. We should have been glad to see some attempt at answering it.

If space permitted, we could point out many other passages in the volume, hardly inferior to those which have preceded in their anti-Catholic and utterly unreasonable character.

*Devotion to the Pope, and Devotion to the Church.* By the late FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, D.D., Priest of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri. Third Edition. London: Richardson & Son.

THE Fathers of the London Oratory have done good service in republishing these two beautiful sermons. They could not have been brought to our recollection at a more opportune moment. It is assuredly not the least precious part of F. Faber's great work in England and Christendom to have taught us to consider our bearing towards the Church and towards the Vicar of Christ as a part of the Spiritual life; to have urged "that devotion to the Pope is an essential part of all Christian piety. It is not a matter which stands apart from the spiritual life, as if the Papacy were only the politics of the Church, an institution belonging to her external life, a divinely-appointed convenience of ecclesiastical government. It is a doctrine and a devotion. It is an integral part of our blessed Lord's plan. He is in the Pope in a still higher way than he is in the poor or in children. A man might as well try to be a good Christian without devotion to our Lady as without devotion to the Pope; and for the same reason in both cases. Both His Mother and His Vicar are parts of our Lord's Gospel" (p. 13).

There are many things in these two sermons which greatly need to be said and resaid, and which no one could say so beautifully or so persuasively as F. Faber. As he repeats more than once in the course of them, "The touchstone which God appears to be using for our probation now is devotion to the Church"; and the danger, as he warns us in a beautiful passage is not only from those without but even more from those within: "We must be upon our guard even against Catholic books, periodicals, journals and pamphlets,

however specious they may be" (p. 31). What wisdom in the principle he applies as a test, "In all matters which concern the relations of the Church with the world, the Saints are the only safe doctors" (p. 32). How much, again, do we need to remind ourselves, as F. Faber says, that "This is a day when God looks for open professions of our faith, for unbashful proclamations of our allegiance. It is a day also when the sense of our outward helplessness casts us more than ever upon the duty of inward prayer. This is the other duty. The open profession is of little worth without the inward prayer, but I think the inward prayer is almost of less worth without the outward profession" (p. 17),

We cannot forbear mentioning an incident connected with this passage which we have from a very authentic source. Shortly after F. Faber's sermon on Devotion to the Pope was published, the Holy Father himself read it in a French translation. He expressed great pleasure at it, ordered it to be translated into Italian, and himself looked over the proof-sheets. In doing this, he was pleased to make one correction with his own hand. In the last sentence we have quoted, which runs—"I think the inward prayer is *almost* of less worth without the outward profession"—the Holy Father struck out the word "almost"!

---

*Lives of the Fathers of the Desert.* Translated from the German of the Countess Hahn-Hahn. By E. F. B. With an introduction, on the Spiritual Life of the First Six Centuries. By J. R. DALGAIRNS, Priest of the Oratory. London: Richardson & Son. 1867.

WE noticed in our last number the learned and interesting preface of F. Dalgairns; and the length of that notice precluded us from speaking of the book itself.

We now redeem the promise we then made, and proceed very briefly to give some account of this most graphic picture of the Saints of the Desert. The readers of Rodriguez are familiar with many sayings of the ancient anchorites, which are one of the many charms of his book on Perfection; and that familiarity is certainly not the familiarity that breeds contempt. E. F. B. has enabled us to learn more of the old Saints, and to see how like they are even to the Saints of modern days. The hard life of the desert was not all the sanctity of a monk; and maceration of the body was not the sole occupation of men who gave up the world. We see that they had to bridle the tongue, to mortify the understanding, just as if they were in a noviciate in our day. The outward mortifications even of S. Simeon on the pillar were a strange sight, but the Saint had been a novice before he was suffered to make himself a spectacle to angels and to men, and his interior mortifications were as many, and as hard to endure, as were those which were visible to the eyes of the world.

There are six chapters devoted to a general view of the primitive times: and then we come to the life of Paul, the first Hermit, who in his youth fled into the desert where he lived forgotten of men and unknown.

"But the remembrance of this holy old man was not to disappear out of the recollection of men. He was a hundred and thirteen years old : his end was approaching, and he knew it and rejoiced. About the same time, Antony, another celebrated solitary, had a temptation to pride : it seemed to him that he was the most perfect anchorite in the whole desert . . . He was now ninety years old, but his strife was not yet over . . . He had a vision in sleep which revealed to him that a patriarch of solitaries lived in the depths of the desert who was much more perfect than himself, and that he was to go in search of him" (p. 85).

S. Antony journeyed to the cavern where S. Paul of Thebes was dying, but he was not easily admitted to the cell of the old man, who wished even in death to be unknown to men. While the two Saints were speaking together—

"A raven came flying to Paul's feet, and gently deposited a loaf of bread. 'How good, God is,' exclaimed the holy old man ; 'for sixty years a raven has daily brought me half a loaf. Now that thou art here, my brother Antony, behold Christ has doubled the provision for his two soldiers.'"

S. Antony was not allowed to witness the dissolution of the old man : he was sent away to his own cell for a cloak which S. Athanasius had given him, and before he could reach the cell of Paul on his return, he saw him in a vision ascend to heaven.

The next life is that of S. Antony, after which we have most admirable histories of the other hermits, including S. Pachomins, who gave a rule and an organization to the solitaries. We have also the lives of those holy women who had S. Jerome for their director, and wonderful lives they are, Fabiola, among others with the Melanies, women who were more than women, and at the same time women throughout. Nothing can be more interesting than this portion of the book.

The translation is admirably done : for the reader has no difficulty to overcome ; that is a sure test of a painstaking and careful work. If the book had been published without notice that it was a translation, no one, unacquainted with the original, could have ascertained the fact.

---

*Lectures on the Nature, the Grounds, and the Home of Faith.* By Rev. J. L. SWEENEY, O.S.B. London : Burns & Oates.

IN these lectures, the ordinary and most convincing argument for the Church's authority is enforced with much clearness and power. Their effect must have been considerable on any Protestant who heard them.

F. Sweeney holds one opinion, shared by him with many theologians, but leading to a consequence which he does not seem to have observed. He holds (p. 24) that "the nature of faith *requires*" an infallible authority, such as the Catholic Church, proposing what is to be believed ; that "it requires *for its existence*" such an authority (p. 39). From this tenet it would follow at once, that no Protestant, however invincible his ignorance of Catholi-

cism, can possess true faith ; for he knows of no infallible authority which he accepts as testifying God's Revelation. And further, since without true faith no one can arrive at justification and salvation, it would also follow from F. Sweeney's tenet that no Protestant, however invincible his ignorance of Catholicism, can possibly be saved. We confess that this conclusion greatly indisposes us to the tenet from which it would undeniably result ; and that we much prefer the doctrine of those theologians, such as Lugo, who think differently. We have referred to this question in our article on the Archbishop's new volume, p. 112.

The following note is admirable. It is well worth quoting, because it bears on one of those features in Unionism which peculiarly scandalize Catholics. We have put some sentences into italics :—

“ As a specimen of the way in which the High Church Unionist party regard the episcopal office as exercised in the Anglican Church, we would refer to two articles in the *Church Times*. In this paper appear correspondence and communications from clergymen of note, who adopt the paper as their organ. In the issue for March 9th, 1867, is a leading article against the proposed increase of the episcopate. The writer says :—‘ Our objection is, that while bishops are appointed as now, and *while they behave as now, the fewer we have of them the better*. As matters stand, the mass of correspondence and purely routine business which a bishop has to get through somehow, keeps him fully occupied, and *he has but little leisure for doing mischief*. But there can be no doubt how he would employ himself if his tasks were lightened one-half. Not in more active visitation, not in theological composition, not in sedulous promotion of practical reforms, but *in bullying those of his clergy who belonged to the unpopular school*.’ He then proceeds to give ten qualifications which he deems a bishop ought to have, and says :—‘ We should be very well content with a prelate who united in himself even half of these qualifications, but it is not possible to say so much of any prelate now on the English Bench. . . . Wherefore, we come to the conclusion that *the fewer bishops like the present we have, the better*. . . . What we want is, *not more bishops, but better ones* ; not fresh tyrants, but reins and curbs for those we have.’ Thinking that such an article would at once provoke the burst of indignation which would follow, if one of our Catholic papers had written in such a manner, we looked at the next number. Not a word of protest from any one ; but to prove that the sentiments expressed on March 9th were not those of the moment merely, the writer returns on March 23rd to the subject, and in a leading article on ‘ The Situation,’ says : ‘ In point of fact there is probably no class of persons in these realms who enjoy so little public confidence as the right rev. bench. Broad Church utterly contemns bishops, both the office and the men who hold it ; Low Church abhors the office, but tolerates it when it happens to have been conferred upon its own adherents ; High Church reveres the office, but—well, we won't say how it regards many of those who in these times have come by sundry “ bye-path and indirect crook'd way ” to the mitre. The notion, therefore, of the bishops asking for more power is really one that we cannot bring ourselves to think of with seriousness.’ And the article proceeds with urging resistance to the bishops in case of any law passed by them against the ritualists in a spirit which cannot but call for the indignation of Catholics, when they find that those who use such language against the very persons who ordain their ministers, pretend to identify themselves with us. Here again prevails that unreal and delusive theory of distinguishing between the office and those who bear it. As well might a person who was convicted of high treason for injuring the person of his sovereign, justify himself by saying,



that he revered the office of royalty, but only attacked the individual who bore it. If the Anglican Church admits that they are in such a position as to be exempt from the obligation of following S. Paul's command, when he says : 'Obey your prelates and be subject to them ; for they watch, as being to render an account of your souls,' then do let them accept this as sufficient evidence that Anglicanism is not Catholicity. It cannot be said that we are acting unfairly in quoting a newspaper as an authority for a Church party, for we cannot help feeling that 'silence gives consent,' inasmuch as not a word of protest, as far as we have been able to see, has appeared in the correspondence of the paper against such disloyal language. If an analogous case occurred in one of our Catholic organs, we know how the sensitiveness of the faithful on such a point would universally manifest itself, and denounce the paper as traitorous to the cause of Religion " (pp. 122, 123).

---

*Apologie des Christenthums.* Von FRANZ HETTINGER, der Philosophie und Theologie Doctor. Herder, 1863.

WE have read through the two volumes of Dr. Hettinger's "Apologia," or, as he elsewhere calls it, "Demonstratio Christiana," with singular pleasure. German works, especially when connected with philosophic speculation, can hardly be characterized as refreshing. One sits down to their perusal with a certain amount of effort, and generally rises up from the task when accomplished with a very unmistakable feeling of relief. The rarefied atmosphere in which the Teutonic mind seems to revel and display itself with greatest vigour to us is simply an oppression ; and when we do manage for a time to slowly sail along in the wake of our more ethereal neighbours, we are glad enough of any excuse which can bring us down safely to *terra firma*.

Moreover, there is often so much barrenness in the intricate and involved creations of the German mind, that we feel as little interest in following them as we should in grinding the air.

We confess to having opened Dr. Hettinger's volumes with some such impressions, but we have been agreeably surprised. It is a long time since we have read the production of a foreign pen, and certainly of a German one, which has afforded us such a thorough pleasure. Dr. Hettinger certainly possesses that Teutonic gift which seems to be special to the Germans, of grasping with a species of transcendental power, and seeing with a more theoretic vision than men of more practical minds, the future bearings of principles as yet inhabiting merely the regions of the Abstract, and of pointing out the relations of truth as it displays itself in the various and often antagonistic developments of rival minds or opposing schools. He appears to possess that marvellous power of following out abstract reasoning to its ultimate conclusions, and pointing, as it were with his finger, to the different centres of human thought from which spring and radiate the multiplicity of laws and of rules which are the norma of action for as many diverse systems of philosophical belief or dogmatic divergence. Such qualities of mind as these are of course naturally more or less expected in a learned German professor ; they form part of the *matériel* of his intellectual warfare, and belong to his special method of combat or defence. But what was not so much to be expected,

and what lends a special charm to the work before us, is a certain, we may say English appreciation of the practical effect of abstract truth, and a genuine hearty and warm love, thoroughly human, of the elements which are waging such a fierce combat in the moral and intellectual world. Dr. Hettinger is not simply treating a number of important propositions ; he does treat propositions, and that with judicious impartiality ; but what seems really to possess his soul, and give warmth and fire to what he writes, carrying the reader along with him occasionally in the impetuosity of the torrent, is his genuine love and yearning for the elevation and purification of the soul and heart of man. His heart is not frozen by inhabiting the high and freezing mountain of mere philosophic theory ; it is warm with the pulse of genuine humanity, and throbs with a sense of the degradation and depravity to which the moral world can be reduced by poisonous elements of thought, while at the same time it makes a strenuous effort to throw the clear light of Truth upon the dark side of Error, and to harmonize the conflicting pretensions of modern thought with the sound and immovable principles of Catholic theology. It is seldom that one apt at abstract speculation has the gift of entering into the heating and boisterous disputes of the living and struggling world, and to appreciate to its fulness the losses and the gains, the light and the darkness, which in various proportions are ever acting as a mist over the eyes of the thinking and reading public. Dr. Hettinger, it appears to us, combines these two qualities in an unusual degree. But not only the gifts of the author reflect with advantage on his book ; there are external reasons which make his work of especial interest. He is engaged in fighting no men of straw. His work treats of some of the most important and vital topics which at present occupy the minds of professors and students and thinking men, not in Germany alone, but in every part of the world where Christian civilization has made its mark. Germany, indeed, may be looked upon as the centre, but there is no Christian community which is not pierced by one of the intellectual radii, which spring from a kindred source. His book is of universal interest. It deals with fundamentals, and embraces within its scope the thoughts and the arguments of all schools and all centuries. What has pleased us more perhaps than anything is the steady and self-conscious orthodoxy which stands unmoved in the stream and the whirl of the opinions and reasonings of the acutest and the subtlest of unbelievers, and the savour of genuine Catholicity which enters into the composition of every argument and the expression of every sentiment of the learned Doctor. It would be but natural to expect, we do not say unorthodox opinions, but perhaps a certain taint of the prevailing elements of unbelief—a certain hardly distinguishable bias towards unhealthy views, which in some Catholic theologians of eminence has been pointed out in recent times. But our author seems to bide steady and strong. The fact is, he knows where the ground is safe, and has selected the best arms for his offensive and defensive warfare. He is not above acknowledging the Angelic Doctor to be his guardian. He takes his stand upon the sound and immovable principles of the "*Summa*," and finds his greatest succour and security in the doctrine of the schools. We have been particularly struck all through this work at the masterly manner in which Dr. Hettinger has pointed out the disease in the mind of the modern philo-

sopher which has been dignified by some sonorous and high-sounding name, and has shown it to be some exploded and vulgar error which had centuries ago received its quietus, one would have thought, from some side-blow given incidentally in one of his marvellous questions by the Angel of the Schools. And not less admirable is the use the author makes of enemies. He appears to us as living in the very midst of the flow of modern thought, and on the alert continually to turn to the account of truth any of the accidental utterances of wisdom which may have escaped the lips of error.

The light of Truth seems hardly to be quite extinguished in the most false-minded intellect; the highest genius standing farthest from the truth, must witness against error from time to time. Rousseau, Fichte, Strauss, and even Feurbach, Vogt, and Moleschott, often unknowingly, and always unwillingly, hold the sacred lamp, point out their own deformity, and utter the most profound and touching sentiments while pouring forth a crude mass of error. The theoretical and practical power of the author, the reality of the warfare in which he is engaged, and the sound theology of his views, together with the wide range of his reading and his vivid appreciation of the days in which we live, are elements which, when found in combination, tend to enhance the value of a work which treats of the most interesting questions of the age in an earnest and practical manner. If we had to point out one shortcoming in the author, we should be inclined to say that perhaps the work might be a little more digested, and that it would rather gain in perspicuity than lose, if he had contented himself with fewer quotations, and had sought to load the subjects he is treating of, rather with well-argued principles than with so many references to authors dead and living. However, though more original matter might be an advantage, it cannot for a moment be denied that the extracts which the learned Doctor does bring forward are not only to the point, but generally contain thoughts of very great beauty and elevation.

The volume before us is divided into two parts; or, in reality, they are two books of about 400 pages each, and each divided into nine chapters. Each chapter treats of some fundamental topic regarding religion or philosophy. As for instance on religious doubt, the kingdom of Truth, the essence and being of God, Naturalism, Pantheism; then there are two chapters on man, one on man and God; the ground and essence of religion, faith, and mystery; the necessity of Revelation, the way of rational belief, wonders and prophecy, the credibility of the Gospel narrative, the divinity of the same, prophecy and its fulfilment, and the word, the work, and the person of Christ.

We have been once or twice tempted to give a few extracts from the more interesting of these chapters, that the reader may judge for himself of the excellence of the volume; but we have each time been unwillingly compelled to desist, as we felt that in such questions as those which the learned author was handling, justice could not possibly be done either to his manner or his matter by a few scanty excerpts. For ourselves, we take leave of this writer with a twofold feeling—one of satisfaction that religion in Germany has such stanch supports, and the other of earnest hope that the day may come when we in England may see an establishment set on foot where men of power

and turn for ecclesiastical learning may be enabled to retire to dedicate their talents undisturbed to the defence of the Church in questions of faith and discipline, and to the creating of a school of English Catholic thought.

---

*A Few Hints to Exeter Hall.* London: Bosworth.

THIS pamphlet is written in so admirable a spirit and so effective a style, that we are the rather compelled to a somewhat invidious task. Theological mistakes are much more likely to do harm, when found in company with much which is so excellent; and we think this writer has fallen into one or two such mistakes, which need to be pointed out.

In page 15 he makes the singular remark that the Pope cannot "enforce a new rule of discipline *without the consent of his Ecclesiastical Court.*" Whence can he have derived so strange an impression? He had just said also that "the Pope can create no new dogma;" a statement most true in itself, but which may very easily be understood as signifying that the Pope can pronounce no new infallible decision. Now Pius IX. alone has pronounced more new infallible decisions than can very easily be enumerated; having been obliged to put them forth, by the unusual activity which religious error has exerted during his Pontificate, in the region of philosophy and ecclesiastical politics.

In page 28 our author lays down as a truth which you "learn from any Catholic priest," "that the priest can absolve only from sins . . . *already forgiven.*" And in page 41 he has some severe remarks on "probabilism," for which he gives no reason, and which lead us greatly to doubt whether he understands the question.

In page 28 by a singular misconception he describes Rosmini as a Jesuit; and his comment on that writer is in many respects objectionable. It runs thus—

"And when Rosmini, a Jesuit, following *the traditions of his Order*, liberal and courageous, wrote the 'Five Wounds of the Church,' a treatise of reforms, Pio Nono saw it, *approved it*, and said, 'This is just what we want.' Two years after, *he allowed it to be placed on the Index*, yielding, it is believed, to the representations of his ministers reluctantly, as a parent may be persuaded by the urgency of his elder children; they thought reforms should not come from the people or the press, but arise from the spontaneous action of the Church. Rosmini's suggestions *were not the less accepted and in many ways acted on.*

In some other parts of the pamphlet there is more respect for liberalism than we quite understand. In page 39, *e. g.*, the author takes for granted that the Revolution of 1848 was a great blessing to Naples.

Yet the general tone is admirable; and if due explanations are made, it will be found an invaluable book to place in the hand of Protestants. There are three particulars to which we would especially direct our readers' attention: the author's enthusiastic praise of the Jesuits; his high appreciation of the Papal Government; and, above all, his deep sense of that love for our

Blessed Lord, which is so peculiarly characteristic of Catholics, and so powerfully promoted by the vast fabric of Marian devotion. We will conclude our imperfect notice with extracts on the two latter heads.

"You cannot pass through the streets of Rome without seeing that something of nobleness and elegance distinguishes the people from our rough northerners (perhaps we ought to be proud of our roughness ; at any rate there it is). And in transactions with all ranks, the suavity and general trustingness of the natives remind one that they expect a similar courtesy from strangers—*an expectation not rarely disappointed*.

"As companions, they are delightful to live with—kind and generous ; many of them highly intelligent and well informed. . . .

"Taking Rome only in its general aspect, and in the cursory way of strangers, I should consider to be as happy, peaceful, and good-humoured a population (always excepting the secret societies) as any in the world.

"It has a loving and paternal sovereign, equitable laws, a court of justice (the Rota) which is the admiration and the model of other nations, very little interference from the authorities, not much police, and *a remarkable absence of all need of it*. Among a people so impulsive and passionate, it is really surprising that acts of violence are so rare.

"During three months in Rome, one duel, which ended in a slight scratch, a mortal stab from a tipsy coachman, and two or three pockets picked, were the whole list of personal offences heard of, in the busiest season of the year, when strangers are crowded even up into the suburbs. And at this bustling time, and during the long winter nights, the safety of the streets was out of all comparison greater than that of London, probably than any city in Europe. The head of our English police, Sir Richard Mayne, told Dr. X. that there was a life lost in his district by violence, 'one might say, for every day in the year.' In the Roman territory there are barely so many as ten in the whole year : two or three stabs given in sudden passion, two or three vendettas (these are by far the worst crimes of the sort, and they are characteristic), . . . some duels, and some lives taken by robbers" (pp. 18, 19).

"These writers seem hardly to suspect that among the Romanists *the love of Christ is incomparably stronger*, the familiar consideration of His divine sacrifice more frequent, the sense of His satisfaction for our sins more vivid, the appropriation of His transcendent merits more intimate and habitual, the reliance on Him Only as the height and depth of our security more exclusive and more entire *than among any separated sect*.

"And this, in fact, is a character that runs through the whole round of controversy with Protestants—*their utter incapacity to appreciate the full devotion of Catholic hearts to their Divine Lord*. They cannot imagine nor believe that there is an exquisite and all-sufficing happiness in the communion with our Saviour which compensates all sacrifices, lightens all burdens, and transcends all the enjoyment that the world can offer to worldly minds.

"Therefore you find, perpetually, proofs that *they cannot approach even to an appreciation of convent life* ; they are inaccessible to all belief in its fascination. Stories so absurd and impossible, that it seems a debasing of the intellect even to refute them, are accepted as satisfactory by Newdegate, and scandalise Dean Close" (pp. 6, 7).

---

*Tracts for the Day.* Essays on Theological Subjects by various Authors. Edited by Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. Nos. I, II, III. London : Longmans.

ON opening these tracts, we soon see that they are written with much care and ability, and in the best possible spirit ; and we wish, therefore to give them as careful a notice as we can. We have been so pressed however this quarter with other employment, that we have really had no time to give them due attention ; and it will be far better therefore to postpone our notice than to give what would be a very imperfect one. In October we hope to do them full justice.

Here we will only say that we hail with great pleasure every fresh appearance of approximation to Roman Catholicism on the part of extreme Anglicans. We are firmly convinced indeed, that all schemes of corporate reunion are essentially delusive and mischievous ; and we think also that various Unionists have fallen into a very un-Catholic and un-Christian tone, from their want of deference to their own superiors, and from their habit of viewing all religious communions "ab extra." But we are very glad of every fresh proof that this evil spirit has by no means leavened the whole mass ; nor can any one rejoice more than we do, at the manifold signs of the Holy Ghost's active working among members of the Anglican body.

*Irish Homes and Irish Hearts.* By FANNY TAYLOR, Author of "Eastern Hospitals," "Tyborne," "Religious Orders," &c. &c. London : Longmans & Co.

THIS work, written by a lady whose cultivation of mind and refinement of style are as remarkable as her enthusiasm is delightful, is a history in brief of the Religious Orders in Ireland, and the active working of the spirit of the greatest of the Christian virtues. The amount of matter she has contrived to compress within the narrow limits of a small volume, is surprising indeed, when the reader finds that the book has none of the uncomfortable jerkiness of a tourist's memoranda, or the bald conciseness of a guide-book. She has seen the things of which she writes with the heart as well as with the eyes, and they have not commended themselves merely to her understanding. Her style is lucid and eloquent, without exaggeration or over adornment ; and the facility and clearness with which she has seized upon the salient points of each undertaking, whose origin, growth, and success she chronicles, give singular strength and purpose to her narrative.

The author of "Irish Homes and Irish Hearts" travelled in Ireland in a similar spirit, and with a somewhat analogous purpose, to those which led Lady Herbert of Lea to Spain, and the result has been alike to both ladies. Each has learned that the noblest products of Catholic lands are their religious



houses, whose inmates are at once the servants of God and of "suffering, sad humanity." The political and social history of Ireland is so melancholy a study, that the relief of turning to such a book as this, with its glad tidings of Faith, and constancy of devotion, work, and sacrifice, is a large element in the pleasure afforded by its perusal. From the dismal penal times to the liberty of the present, in which the religious orders are spreading, multiplying, and bearing their fruit in the salvation of souls, and their persistent protest for the cause of God against the world—is a delightful change, albeit modified by the detestable system of "souperism," which is exposed by this lady with equal plainness and moderation of language. Her tour of inspection was thorough; more so than is her catalogue of its results. She has to content herself with only indicating several of the charitable institutions in Dublin which are under the charge of religious, but of the more striking and important, as the Hospital of S. Vincent de Paul, the Mater Misericordia, the Night Refuge, founded by Dr. Spratt, and the Asylum for the Blind, the Insane, and the Deaf and Dumb, she gives minute and most interesting particulars. Several short sketches of the history of individuals, those who commenced the good work in dark and dangerous times, are deeply interesting and touching; and in particular the history of Honoria Nagle, the founder of the Presentation Order, and that of Catherine Plunket, the beloved niece of the great Archbishop of Armagh, in whose martyrdom the worst times of the persecution of the Church in Ireland culminated. More modern, but not less wonderful as examples of the strength with which the love of God inspires his weakest creatures, are the sketches of Mrs. Aithenhead, the foundress of the order of Irish Sisters of Charity, and of Mrs. McArcley, the foundress of the order of Sisters of Mercy. The number and various purposes of the institutions under the charge of these sisters are wonderful, and the coldest could not fail to be touched by the far-reaching foresight and ingenuity of the methods to which they resort for doing good to their fellow-creatures, in body and soul. After a careful investigation of her subject in Dublin and its environs, the author visited Drogheda, a place fruitful in memories alike heroic and terrible, and which furnishes a theme for the most picturesque, and, from a literary point of view, the best chapter in the book. Having visited Kerry, and told the strange story of the foundation there of the Poor Clares, and its growth, though exposed to the most savage and cowardly forms of Orange persecution, she goes to Cork, Killarney, and Kenmare, of which places she gives a most animated description, concluding with an account of the sailing of the "holy ship," with its precious freight of two bishops, six priests, and eighteen nuns, for certain ports in Australia. Then she returned again to Dublin, to study the work of the Sisters of Loretto, and the Poor Clares, and to look for herself into the social condition of the people among whom they prosecute their ceaseless, untiring toil. The chapter in which she sums up the result of her observations is truly admirable. It might serve for a small text-book of "the Irish question." It is not to be regretted that the space at our disposal forbids our making extracts from this book. "Irish Homes and Irish Hearts" is one of those rare instances in which an extract is an impertinence.

*Charge of the Lord Chief Justice of England to the Grand Jury at the Central Criminal Court, in the Case of the Queen against Nelson and Brand.*  
Revised and Corrected by the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE. With occasional Notes. Second Edition. Ridgway, Piccadilly, 1867.

**W**E would heartily recommend any person to buy and read this Charge, if he feels himself in danger of indulging too freely in indignation when he thinks of Mr. Eyre, Colonel Nelson, Lieutenant Brand, and Provost-Marshal Ramsay, after all that they have done, escaping not only unpunished but untried, owing to the findings of the Grand Juries, both in Jamaica and England. Any one who reads it will feel that, supposing them to share only the common feelings of not over-sensitive men, they are heartily to be pitied. A Charge by the Lord Chief Justice of England is something much more serious and lasting than a newspaper article. Mr. Eyre and his agents have had the comfort of feeling that they have been defended, and even praised, by the majority of the newspapers. But the articles in their favour are already half forgotten. The Charge of the Lord Chief Justice will ever be a leading authority upon many important constitutional subjects, as long as English freemen exist in any quarter of the globe, and every man who reads will be struck alike by his care to avoid every harsh word towards Mr. Eyre, Colonel Nelson, and their subordinates, his anxious desire to insist upon every consideration \* which may in any degree excuse or apologize for them, and by the deep abhorrence with which he regards their conduct. The Grand Jury exercised the power given them by law to prevent the trial of the prisoners. The Lord Chief Justice waits several months, and then publishes his Charge with notes, which add to its force ; and in the last of these notes he says :—

“ The fact that among the educated classes of this highly civilized country persons can be found to uphold and applaud such proceedings (although I believe very few persons who do so have taken the trouble to read the report of the Commissioners, or the evidence taken by them, or to make themselves acquainted with the facts), seems to me to render the necessity for legislation to prevent such barbarities in future only more apparent.”

Moreover, at the moment at which we write, the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, Mr. Adderley, has laid on the table of the House of Commons a set of instructions to all our Colonial Governors, one of which calls for the repeal of all Colonial statutes which profess to make it legal to declare martial law. The other lays down minute instructions how governors are to act in any case of extreme necessity which compels them to violate the existing law, in the confidence that they will be secured by an act of indemnity from legal penalties. The Lord Chief Justice says no man ought to be placed under

---

\* Thus, for instance, while compelled to blame very severely the long continuance of martial law, he admits that “ if it can in any case lawfully be put in force at all,” the circumstances attending the recent outbreak were such as, at the first onset, to warrant its application.

such circumstances, but that "if it be deemed desirable that there should be power to resort" to martial law, "in great emergencies," that power should be recognized and established by Parliament. Be this as it may, Mr. Adderley's task has evidently been made comparatively easy by Mr. Eyre. If he wishes to point out the evils to which a very gross abuse of martial law can possibly lead, he has only to trace what Mr. Eyre did and sanctioned during the months of October and November, 1865. If he wishes to point out the precautions and safeguards to which a governor ought to have recourse under such circumstances, he has only to mention those which Mr. Eyre omitted. It is a comfort to feel that in this way at least Mr. Eyre's administration may do as much good throughout the whole British empire as it did mischief in Jamaica. This is the way in which salutary changes in law and practice are usually brought about under our system of government. An obsolete law lies for years forgotten, or an objectionable practice unnoticed, until passion or panic leads some governor to give an exaggerated example of all the injustice and cruelty to which it is capable of being abused: and this leads to its correction for the future. We heartily hope and believe that henceforth such scenes as those of Jamaica will be impossible in the British empire, and Mr. Eyre's name will go down to posterity as that of the governor whose gross abuse of what has been called martial law led to the abandonment of the whole system. The name of Lord Chief Justice Cockburn will be connected in a more honourable manner with the same change. All the best qualities of the Chief Justice's intellect and character are strikingly exemplified in the Charge before us. It begins by reciting the facts of the case as they bore upon Colonel Nelson and Lieutenant Brand. It then examines in detail the question "whether there is such a thing as martial law, in the sense in which it is used by those who talk of it with reference to the trial of civilians—whether in this sense there is such a thing as martial law known to the law of England." For this purpose the Chief Justice "traces the history of martial law back to its fountain-head, to see when it originated in its application to civilians, and when and where and how it has been exercised." This historical examination, which we have not room to follow at length, occupies from page 24 to 57. The impression upon every reader will be one of surprise how entirely without historical foundation is the general idea; founded, the Chief Justice thinks, upon some loose statements of Hume's, that under the Tudors and Plantagenets, "whenever there was any insurrection or public disorder, the Crown employed martial law, and it was during that time exercised not only over the soldiers, but over the whole people. Any one might be punished as an aider or abettor of rebellion, whom the Provost-Marshal or Lord-Lieutenant of a county, or their deputies, chose to suspect." This leads the Chief Justice to denounce "the utter untrustworthiness of this elegant writer but most unscrupulous historian, in respect of this and every other branch of the prerogative, when writing with a view to defend the unconstitutional proceedings of Charles I." It seems in fact that the only precedents were some extraordinary proclamations in the violent time of the so-called Reformation, which moreover do not seem to have been acted upon, and were probably intended only to frighten the ignorant and disaffected populace. Next he examines the authority,

either in the writings of great lawyers or in judicial decisions, or in the way of statutory recognition or disaffirmance of the prerogative. As to legal authorities, they are all the other way. In Acts of Parliament words have been used by way of saving the prerogative, which imply that something of the kind existed ; but these have evidently been only intended to avoid indirectly and unintentionally depriving the Crown of any power it might possess, not to assert that it did possess it. They left matters as they were. On the whole, the Chief Justice comes to the conclusion that the only martial law which he can find as having had at any period, and under any circumstances, any legal existence in England (and he shows conclusively that whatever is true in this matter of England is also true of Jamaica) is "the law applicable to military duties and offences"—the power of the king over soldiers and sailors on service.

Next he shows that even this power over soldiers and sailors has been clearly defined, and its limits laid down by numerous Acts of Parliament in later times, as well as by ordinances and proclamations of our kings at earlier periods. This is important, because a dictum of the Duke of Wellington has been much insisted on, that "martial law is neither more nor less than the will of the general who commands the army. In fact martial law means no law at all. Therefore the general who declares martial law, and commands that it shall be carried into execution, is bound to lay down the rules, regulations, and limits, according to which his will is to be carried out."

The Lord Chief Justice says this "opinion was that of a very great man, and as to what may be done in an enemy's country in time of war, may be perfectly sound—on that I pronounce no opinion—but I cannot accept the opinion even of so great a man as authority on a question of law, and I certainly should not recommend anybody to act upon it, in case martial law should be proclaimed in our own country, or to rely on it as a protection if called upon to answer for his conduct in a court of justice for any injury inflicted on a fellow-subject in the exercise of martial law" (p. 101).

A notion has existed that there are two kinds of martial law,—the ordinary one exercised over soldiers and sailors, and an extraordinary one, over all persons in time of rebellion. For this opinion the Chief Justice has been unable to find any authority whatever, either in the laws or history of England, or in the great legal writers. What comes nearest to it are some opinions "extrajudicial, and probably given without much consideration," by two or three distinguished lawyers of our own day ; to wit, Lord Campbell, Lord Cottenham, and Sir David Dundas. He asks :—

"Whence then has arisen this doctrine as to the distinction between martial and military law, unknown as it evidently was to our great legal writers ? Partly, I think, from the loose language of historians, who, when they speak of rebels and insurgents put to death without trial, are apt to apply the term martial law to such summary proceedings. Partly from the reckless assertions of Hume, too long the oracle of a credulous public, who describes martial law as 'a prompt, arbitrary, and violent mode of decision,' and who without the shadow of authority affirms, &c. . . . Partly from the inaccurate language even of Hale and Blackstone themselves. Nothing, however, can be clearer, when the context is looked at, than that both these writers were

speaking of the law applicable to the soldier, for which, in their day, the term martial law, or law martial, was the only designation in use."

It is a curious and startling fact, but distinctly proved in this book, that so far is martial law, as commonly understood, from being, as is commonly imagined, any remnant of the arbitrary and cruel proceedings of despotic times, that in fact there is more precedent and grave authorities for it in the last century, and most especially since the accession of Queen Victoria, than are to be found in the whole of our previous history and laws.

The points laid down by the Lord Chief Justice have hitherto been three. *First*, that the proceedings against Mr. Gordon, if they would have been unlawful in England, were unlawful in Jamaica. *Next*, that after very careful examination and study, he is wholly unable to find any authority whatever for the trial and punishment of civilians by martial law. *Thirdly*, that, assuming such a thing can in any case be lawful, there is only one kind of martial law, and that civilians, if subject to it at all, are entitled to every safeguard which has been laid down for the trial of soldiers.

Next he passes on to "whether G. W. Gordon, who was put to death under the sentence of this court-martial was amenable to its jurisdiction, if that jurisdiction existed?" Upon this point he says:—

"I entertain a very strong opinion that the whole proceeding—the seizing him where he was, the putting him on board a steamer and taking him to Morant Bay, and handing him over to the martial tribunal—was altogether unlawful and unjustifiable. To Mr. Gordon it made the difference of life and death. I say so advisedly, because, after the most careful perusal of the evidence which was adduced against him, I come irresistibly to the conclusion that, if the man had been tried upon that evidence—I must correct myself—he could not have been tried on that evidence. No competent judge acquainted with the duties of his office could have received that evidence. Three-fourths—I had almost said nine-tenths—of the evidence upon which that man was committed and sentenced to death was evidence which, according to no known rules—not only of ordinary law but of military law—according to no rules of right and justice, could possibly have been admitted; and it never would have been admitted if a competent judge had presided, or if there had been the advantage of a military officer of any experience in the practice of courts-martial, who knew by what rules a tribunal desirous of doing justice ought to be governed in the reception of evidence against a person who stands accused, especially a man who stands accused upon a charge which involves his life. And I must further say that, looking at this evidence, I come irresistibly to the conclusion that no jury, however influenced by prejudice and passion, arising out of local or other circumstances, if they had been guided by a competent impartial and honest judge, could upon evidence so morally and intrinsically worthless, and, as I shall show you presently, so wholly inconclusive as that evidence was, have condemned that man on the charges on which he was tried" (p. 115).

The Chief Justice then shows that the excuses invented by writers here for sending Mr. Gordon for trial at Morant Bay, are wholly without foundation. This is very important, because we have repeatedly heard it laid down in society and seen it asserted by newspaper writers, that Governor Eyre was obliged by law to send him there for trial. For that statement there is not so much as a pretence of foundation. Upon that point the Chief Justice

leaves no possibility of doubt. It did not, however, affect Nelson and Brand, having been the personal act of Mr. Eyre, who was not then before the Court.

As to the prisoners, the law was laid down thus. If they had no jurisdiction, then to condemn a fellow-subject to death, "under the notion of supposed jurisdiction which did not in fact exist, is in law murder. The Chief Justice could find no pretence of any jurisdiction ; but as "further judicial proceedings may take place," and come before him, he purposely abstained from expressing an opinion. He told the grand jury that they should find a true bill if they thought there was any the least doubt as to the jurisdiction of the Court. "If you are of opinion, upon the whole, that the jurisdiction to exercise martial law is not satisfactorily made out, and that it is a matter which ought to be submitted to further consideration on the trial of the accused before a competent Court, where all the questions of law incident to the discussion and decision of the case may be fully raised and authoritatively considered and decided, then I must say that I think it the safer course to let this matter go forward " (p. 155).

By ignoring the bill, the grand jury decided that they were so certain that the Lord Chief Justice was quite wrong in his law in questioning the legality of martial law as exercised over civilians, and, moreover, in believing that if it could be extended to them at all, it is limited in their case by the same restrictions imposed by statute upon martial law when applied to soldiers, that they thought it a matter not deserving any consideration or inquiry.

There was also another question put to them by the Chief Justice, which was, whether, even assuming that they had jurisdiction to try Gordon at all, they had rightly condemned him.

"I must call your attention to the evidence which was given on the trial of Mr. Gordon, to the extraordinary character of that evidence, to the inconclusiveness of it, and to the conviction which took place, notwithstanding the moral worthlessness of the proof. You must judge for yourselves as to whether you think a that case is made out on which the accused ought to be put upon their trial for having in their repective capacities dealt dishonestly and corruptly in the condemnation and execution of Gordon. If you think not, *so far as this part of the case is concerned*, you will throw out this indictment. If you think there is, you will find a true bill."

Our space has compelled us to do very scant justice to this most important, able, and temperate charge, for which every Englishman and every lover of justice throughout the world owes thanks to the Lord Chief Justice.

---



## Correspondence.

---

[It is, of course, out of the question that we should insert argumentative replies to any of our articles. On the other hand, whenever we find ourselves to have unintentionally misrepresented an opponent, it is our bounden duty to retract and explain. But there is an intermediate case, *viz.*, where an opponent mistakenly *thinks* us to have misrepresented him. We would not ordinarily insert the remonstrance of such an opponent; but yet an exception to this general rule may be permissible. Now we think so very unfavourably of Mr. Ffoulkes's opinions—we have said, and are likely hereafter to say so much against them—that we are particularly desirous he should not suspect us of personal unfriendliness. We have thought it better, therefore, on the whole, to insert the following letter; to which we append a very brief reply.]

### *To the Dublin Reviewer of Christendom's Divisions.—Part I.*

DEAR SIR,—I cannot believe for a moment that you have been desirous of merely writing down a book that you did not like, or consider opposed to your own private views, but you must excuse me for saying that the greater part of your criticisms seem founded on a simple misapprehension of its intent and aim. It assumes neither to be a didactic treatise on Church-government, nor on the formation of Christendom (a subject just now in abler hands than mine), but, as its title implies, on “Christendom's divisions.” It endeavours to show how they arose, and what occasioned them.

When S. James asks, “From whence come wars and fightings among you?” what is his answer? From the Spirit of God that is in you? certainly not. “From your own lusts,” according to him; and he goes on to say: Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, “The Spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy.” Who ever argued from hence that S. James denied baptismal regeneration? Similarly, there is a human as well as a divine element involved in the papacy, and because it is the human element that I have to dwell upon almost exclusively in treating of Christendom's divisions, must I therefore be set down as having denied the divine? What I mean by the human element in the papacy is so fully brought out in the facts adduced in my new volume that I need only refer you to them.

2. A remark of yours, p. 405, is “This singular notion that the history of the Church is to be found in the history of the Jews seems to underlie all that our author has written.” True; but I had written a book on all this as far back as 1853, called “The Counter-Theory,” to which a long and elaborate

article was devoted in the DUBLIN soon after its appearance. I refer to it, note 5. Had you consulted it, you might have found several of your objections answered beforehand. At all events you must have seen that this theory had not prevented my joining the Roman communion, which my reviewer in the DUBLIN in fact prophesied it would lead me to do. It certainly had that effect on me : nor can I now explain many facts in Church-history without it ; you may start objections to it, but can you offer any better explanation of those facts which I explain by means of it without shirking or ignoring their full force ?

3. I notice that in several places you take exception to my statements, where I am in fact but repeating others. For instance, p. 417, "Could it have been otherwise than a mere question of time to delegate to him (the Pope) the same executive powers over Christendom generally that had been already delegated to metropolitans over provincial (churches)." Now in all this I was merely giving what I took to be the plain sense of Can. Apost. 27, about the obedience to be paid by the bishops of every province to their chief bishop ; and canons 3, 4, and 5 of Sardica respecting appeals to Rome. These canons were passed by a number of bishops in Synod I presume. Again, p. 421, my words are given : "As far as the sanctuary is concerned, one bishop, one priest, one deacon, is as good as another ;" in all this I was merely paraphrasing S. Jerome, Ep. cxlvi. All bishops are equals amongst themselves. The bishop of Rome is no more than the bishop of Bethlehem, nor he of Constantinople more than he of Rhegium ; all are invested with the same priesthood ; all have the same dignity."

4. In the two following passages I am sure you will own on second thoughts you have *much* mis-represented me :—

a. "Mr. Ffoulkes, continuing his observations on the shortcoming of the middle ages, attacks S. Thomas, and thinks the Saint in error more or less for his inadequate discussion of the doctrine of Justification . . ." (p. 429) ; and b. "He praises heretics and excuses them . . . but for the Catholic theologian, what has he to say ?"

As regards justification (and "mutatis mutandis," the same with regard to my remarks on penance, p. 424) all I say, or meant to say, amounts to no more than what has been often said before, *e.g.* by S. Augustine (De Præd. ii. 20), "Didicimus enim singulas quasque hæreses intulisse ecclesiæ proprias questiones, contra quas diligentius defenderetur Scriptura divina, quàm si nulla necessitas cogeret." The subject had excited no controversy when S. Thomas wrote : hence he is not so full on it as those who wrote after Luther. Me attack S. Thomas ! after I had written of his *Summa* : "Shall we not recognize in it one of the grandest pictures of man in his state of grace ever achieved by man ; one to which western Christendom can never cease to look back upon with just pride, as being, in a peculiar sense, its own ; as one of the vastest and most imperishable monuments ever reared to truth on the deepest of all earthly subjects" . . . and a good deal more (p. 78). Was it right to pass over all I had said there of S. Thomas and his contemporaries, all I had said (p. 131) of what was done in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries for good by others, all that I had said (pp. 182–88) of the great achievements of the Jesuits, and ask at the end of your article, "for the Catholic

theologian what has he to say?" or again, to state summarily: "he praises heretics and excuses them," without quoting any one passage in which I had done so. I had distinctly headed p. 754, "Errors of Luther weighed against corruptions in the Church." Was I praising Luther when I spoke of his errors? On the other hand, if I was wrong in pointing out how many things needed reforming in the Church of his day, what is to be said of all those popes cited by me, from Martin V. to Pius IV., who spoke of a thorough reformation of the head and members of the Church as what they wanted so much to effect? The heading of the first chapter in the "*Histoire des Variations*" by Bossuet is "*La réformation de l'Église était désirée depuis plusieurs siècles.*" And the Archbishop of Besançon in 1808, commenting on the facts adduced by Bossuet in his letter to M. Beaufort, says: "*Tandis que Luther resta dans les bornes d'une certaine moderation . . . il parut loin de vouloir ébranler l'édifice du Catholicisme. Il ne demandait que la réformation des certaines choses qu'il jugeait des abus.*" In the hypothetical case quoted from me, p. 432, I suppose Luther to have emigrated *before* he fell into heresy, not afterwards; while he was only agitating for reform, as the archbishop says. Yet for merely supposing this, I am charged in the "table of contents" of your article, p. ii., with "implicitly denying the definitions of Trent," which in p. 43 of my book I had extolled to the skies. Is this *quite* the treatment that one Catholic, especially in these days, should receive from another?

Yours very faithfully,

EDMUND S. FFOULKES.

1. We did not profess to review the whole of the book, and so we said we should "confine ourselves to one subject;" the author's accounts of the origin and growth of the Church.

2. Mr. Ffoulkes, by his interpretation of the Old Testament, denies that the Papacy existed before the conversion of Constantine, and maintains that the Fathers, not necessarily Popes, governed the Church, fulfilling the alleged prophecy in the history of the Judges. All Catholics must account this theory heretical. It may have helped Mr. Ffoulkes into the Church; but so did the letters of the high priest help S. Paul: nevertheless persecuting Catholics is not, therefore, to be recommended.

3. Mr. Ffoulkes said that "inequalities" among bishops "whom the rite of consecration had left equals," were introduced by themselves. For this he now quotes S. Jerome. Well; does he really think that S. Jerome considered the Bishop of Rhegium as the equal of S. Damasus, Pope? The question is not about orders only, but is about jurisdiction as well; for Mr. Ffoulkes uses the word "service" of God.

4. Mr. Ffoulkes described the Mediæval Catholics as having learned grossly erroneous notions of the Sacraments, and as being roused to consciousness by Luther's preaching of justification by faith only. Now, one of the teachers of the Mediæval Catholics was S. Thomas; another was Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris; and of these he says that the latter does not speak of justification at all—contrary to the fact—in the Book of the Sentences, and that S. Thomas gave to that doctrine "a mere corner" in his work. We thought this, and think still that it was an attack on S. Thomas:

5. Praising heretics and excusing them is the next charge. "Such distinguished men" is an expression of praise, we think; and Mr. Ffoulkes applies it to two men who are certainly not Catholics. Luther was "excused," and the explanation now offered is that he is supposed "to have emigrated before he fell into heresy." That surely cannot be correct, for Luther crosses the sea, "Bible in hand;" that is, after adopting Protestantism and rebelling against the Church. Mr. Ffoulkes said that the supposed emigrants and their descendants might have lived "without deviating in the slightest degree from the most rigid orthodoxy:" but as they had neither priests nor sacraments; as they were out of the Church, in virtue of the principle which made them emigrate; and as they neither did, nor would, nor could, hold the definitions of Trent; the conclusion is plain enough. He who maintains their orthodoxy contradicts the definitions of Trent.

As to Mr. Ffoulkes's last question, we would rather retort it on him. Is his volume *quite* such a book as a Catholic might expect to be written by one who wishes to be counted among the children of the Roman Catholic Church?

---

In our last number we quoted an interesting passage from Dr. Northcote on our Blessed Lady's heroic bearing at the Foot of the Cross (p. 443). A writer in the *Tablet*, discussing the matter in a most friendly and temperate way, raised one or two objections against Dr. Northcote's view; and, as the question is one of much devotional interest to lovers of Mary, we think our readers will thank us for inserting the letter. We add a reply to it from another priest. Our sympathies—as we expressed in April—are with our own correspondent; but as the whole question is, of course, most entirely an open one, we see no reason for adding comment on either side.

#### *Letter to the Tablet.*

SIR,—In an able and interesting article on Dr. Northcote's recent publication, which appears in the current number of the DUBLIN REVIEW, I read the following passage:—

"Our Blessed Lady was there (at the Crucifixion), in company with the holy women, but not like them (Luke xxiii. 27) did she give way to wailing and lamentation."

The reviewer is here following his author, who, in a passage which he proceeds to quote, and with which he seems entirely to concur, says of Our Lady: "There is an entire absence of every sign of natural weakness and of woe."

Does the reviewer or his author mean hereby to exclude the profuse shedding of tears, which is surely a "sign of woe," though no proof of 'natural weakness' in any faulty sense, since it is recorded even of Our Lord that he wept over Jerusalem, and over the grave of his friend? The Church would seem to ascribe not only tears, but "torrents of tears," to our Blessed Lady at the Crucifixion and its sequel. Not merely is the epithet "lacry-

mosa" applied to her in the *Stabat Mater*, but the sense of that expression is amplified and enlarged upon in the exquisitely beautiful hymn for the feast of the Seven Dolours in September :—

O quot undis lacrymarum,  
Quo dolore volvitur,  
Luctuosa de cruento  
Dum revulsum stipite,  
Cernit ulnis incubantem  
Virgo Mater Filium !

Os suave, mite pectus,  
Et latus dulcissimum,  
Dexteramque vulneratam,  
Et sinistram sauciam,  
Et rubras cruore plantas,  
Ægra tingit lacrymis.

Centiesque, milliesque  
Stringit arctis nexibus,  
Pectus illud et lacertos  
Illa figit vulnera,  
Sicque tota colliquescit  
In doloris osculis.

This seems a description of passionate grief, rather than of statue-tranquillity. It is also worthy of the learned reviewer's consideration, that, in the same office of the Seven Dolours, the Church, who in the series of responsories at Matins, commemorates the Dolours in their order, applies to the fourth of them (the meeting with Our Lord on the way to Calvary), those very words of the Gospel to which the reviewer draws attention as suggestive of a contrast between our Blessed Lady and the other holy women—"Jesum, bajulantem sibi crucem, sequebatur turba mulierum, quæ plangebant et lamentabantur eum."—Resp. Lect. iv.

Your obedient Servant,

April 14th.

A PRIEST.

*To the Editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW.*

SIR,—As I have given a good deal of thought to the subject, will you allow me to offer a suggestion or two upon the Desolation of our Blessed Lady in the Triduo? The occasion of my doing so was the perusal of a letter in the *Tablet*, the writer of which, resting upon a hymn of the Church, endeavours to make her devotion there, as little as possible like Desolation, and as much as possible like to sensible sweetness.

Certainly I should like to accept as literally true a view of the matter put before me by a hymn of the Church. But, if grave reasons prevent my doing so, then for literal truth, I am driven to substitute a kind of pious fiction, so to say. But I will explain my meaning by-and-by, after I have put forward my grave reasons, or at least what strike me as such.

Now, if *thousands* of kisses were to be given to the Sacred Corpse, to give them reverently there must be great expenditure of *time*. Let us see then if the Gospels do not preremptorily refuse to us any such time. S. Mark and S. Luke say of Joseph of Arimathea: having taken it—the Sacred

Corpse—down, he rolled it in the linen. This looks as if the latter action followed immediately upon the former. It is just *possible* that an interval should have occurred between the two actions ; but likely it is not. For Joseph must be included in *all* Christ's acquaintance, who by that time (Luke xxiv. 47) had rallied round the Cross. He had then to go *in* to Pilate, and as he did not go *in* till it was late, he did not get back till it was later. There is then but a small space between "late," and six o'clock of our time, when the Sabbath began.

Into this short space the Gospels compel us to crowd the two processes of taking down, and of embalming with a hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes—no cassia mind. Where then is there any space left for anything like a *thousand* reverent kisses ? I am not saying that it is impossible to reconcile the hymn, if literally taken, with the Gospel, but that to me in particular, as at present informed, the two accounts appear to be as incompatible as can well be.

The Psalm Eructavit has many difficulties in it ; but I can safely say that I have myself no doubt whatever, that it is in the original a prophecy of S. John's adoration of God's Corpse. Without pretending to enter into a plenary justification of that view of the matter here, I may notice one or two things, which tend to justify it. (1) The Psalm clearly contemplates a time when Christ has *fellows* in His oil of gladness. This He had in Limbo and *nowhere else* before the Resurrection. (2) Neither the *and* nor the *cassia* belong, I think, to the original. We may translate that original thus :

Myrrh and aloes, finely parted,  
Are Thy only garments (now).

S. John will then go on to invite the Queen to forget the Jews, and to *kneel* and adore God's Corpse ; and thus we shall secure a Scriptural sanction for *some* adoration, indeed, though none for any long adoration. The Queen was *standing* before at the recently wounded right of the Corpse.

If, then, Holy Writ leaves us no room for any long adoration, how are we to manage the thousand kisses of the hymn ? I will state why I think them pure fiction. What the Church aims at in her hymns is at encouraging such devotion as shall be intelligible to the run of Catholics. Intense aridity, real, genuine desolation, is a thing of which the run of Catholics have no cognizance of an experimental nature. It would not minister to their devotion to set such desolation before them, as a weeping and kissing Mother does administer thereto. In like manner, the succour of our Angel, *after* we are in trouble, is consoling to us. So the Church in the Hymn for Christ's Prayer in the Garden represents Christ as getting strength from the Angel *after* the bloody sweat. Let any one ponder the account of the beloved Physician (Luke xxii. 43-44), and he must, I think, see that S. Luke puts the infusion of strength (ἐνισχύων) by the Angel *before* the bloody sweat.

This then is what I meant by "pious fiction," as opposed to historical truth. The Church considers what will move the greater number to devotional feeling, and shapes her hymns accordingly. Such is my view of the matter, to which I find myself, not altogether willingly I grant, driven by what seems



to me the plain meaning of Holy Writ. But I shall be glad if a better mode of reconciling the two can be pointed out to me.

A partial parallel to this disagreement of the hymns with the Scripture, may be found in a similar disagreement of things, revealed in visions about the Passion, therewith. For example any one who really studies the Gospel, will see that there is no *time* for the thousands of scourge-wounds which some visions represent Jesus as receiving. It is only a mode of setting before a Saint's mind in *extension* of time, *intension* of suffering. To the Gospel student, this looks at first like absurd and unauthorized exaggeration. But on weighing things fairly he will see, that that which cannot be pressed as literally true, is perhaps the only way in which the intensity of the Mother's sufferings can be set before the human imagination. When Julian speaks of Christ's suffering three hours or so 'a sennet's pain,' she measures the intensity of Christ's pain by extension of time, very much in the same way as the Church's thousand kisses measure the intensity of our Lady's love to Jesus.

I might add that we are encouraged by the Church to view our Lady's pains in the Triduo, as those of "Desolation." To my own mind it is clear that they were twofold: they were pains of sense, and pains of loss. The former came from the sight and touch of the mangled Corpse of God, and the latter from its being buried out of her sight. How each of these pains co-operated with what Christ's Soul was doing in Purgatory or in Limbo, it would be impossible here to discuss. But if they were accompanied literally and really with a profusion of sensible devotion and loving tears, I cannot see how they deserve the name of "Desolation." The most horrible and distressing aridity seems to me to be far, far more probable, because the greater her sufferings were, the greater would her co-operation be with what Jesus's Soul was working out in the other world.

If I have ventured to state boldly my difficulties in the way of accepting a literal meaning for the September Hymn, I can assure your readers that this is no random view of the matter, but one with myself of long standing, and based upon a long-continued study of the Passion as a well-organized and connected whole, in every stage of which some definite good is merited for the Church or its children.

Yours sincerely

J. B. M.



THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

OCTOBER, 1867.

---

ARTICLE I. — SPIRITISM AND MODERN DEVIL-  
WORSHIP. — F. PERRONE “DE VIRTUTE  
RELIGIONIS.”

*Prælectiones Theologicæ de Virtute Religionis deque Vitiis Oppositis, nominatim vero de Mesmerismi, Somnambulismi ac Spiritismi recentiori Superstitione. Auctore Jo. PERRONE, S.J., in Collegio Romano Studiosum Præfecto. Ratisbonæ: 1866.*

“THERE is no devil; or if there be a devil, he lacks either  
“ the power that would enable him, or the malice that  
“ would stimulate him, to interfere at all, or to interfere much  
“ in human affairs. Men’s good and evil acts are in the main  
“ to be referred to their own good or evil dispositions, ener-  
“ gized more or less by the accidents of education, example,  
“ sympathy, and the like: they owe little or nothing to  
“ external influences, whether coming from the world above  
“ or from the world below.”

This is, we think, a pretty fair statement of doctrines which are at the present day held by large masses of men, who profess Christianity outside the pale of the Church. Of course no genuine Catholic holds them, or can hold them; nevertheless there is, as there ever has been and ever will be, a number of persons who not only profess, but really believe everything expressly defined by the Church, yet believe with a cold, ungenial, contracted faith; having their minds not, indeed, utterly corrupted, but more or less tainted by the worldly atmosphere in which they live or have been educated; captious, querulous, self-willed; retaining the gold of the true faith, but retaining it discoloured with the hues of a baser metal. For the sake of such persons, and still more for the sake of those who, though well disposed, have not been sufficiently instructed on the relations existing between the invisible and visible world, we make no apology to our readers for offering some

preliminary remarks on this interesting topic—connected as it is, not only intimately, but essentially and fundamentally, with the main subject of the present article.

To the careful student of theology, of ecclesiastical history, and of religious biography, the mind of the Church will appear to lean to few things more decidedly than to the close, constant, and universal action of supernatural influences on the inward and the outward man, his thoughts and inclinations, his works and ways. These influences, everywhere sensible in the effects which they produce, are not unfrequently manifested by sensible accompanying signs. No Catholic can deny that, in every age, from that of the Apostles down to our own, there have been frequent and striking indications of God's abiding presence and working in His Church—the communion of Saints outwardly signified, not only in public and private worship ascending from earth to heaven, but by sensible manifestations descending from heaven to earth. Take away as much as you will of what you are pleased to call fabulous or doubtful, still enough will remain to show that, in every age, God has been "wonderful in His saints." And, what is specially worthy of note, those lives of saints which are most detailed, and whose truthfulness cannot be questioned, contain the greatest number of those manifestations. Take, as an example, the Oratorian life of S. Mary Magdalene of Pazzi. The author, F. Cepari, was a religious, not only of high repute for sanctity, and therefore of scrupulous veracity, but also a person of distinguished prudence, judgment, and theological knowledge.\* He was for some years confessor to the Holy virgin, and composed her life from the most direct and authentic sources of information. The narrative of such a writer cannot be called in doubt, especially in what he affirms of his own personal knowledge, except on a principle of scepticism, that would throw a shadow on the far greater part of undisputed history. This life exhibits a picture of extraordinary communion with the supernatural world, continued almost daily for many years. Yet it is but one specimen of what may be seen in hundreds upon hundreds of the lives of saints worshipped in the Church. These rays of celestial light are not, however, confined to this golden circle; they shoot out beyond it, with more or less splendour, on every side.

---

\* Benedict XIV., in his great work on Canonization, often refers to him in terms of very high praise. A short account of F. Cepari is given in the Latin edition of his life of B. Berchmans, published at Louvain in 1853. The life of S. M. of Pazzi is a perfect model of sacred biography.

Not less certain and continuous, though not so often and so manifestly displayed, as such, are the agencies of the spirits of darkness among the fallen children of Adam. As we have already intimated, we are not writing polemically, with a view of proving against non-Catholics, but rather with the view of putting before our Catholic readers the conclusions and reasonings of our own theology: it will suffice, therefore, to state conclusions which, though in most cases not expressly defined by the Church, yet have in their favour such a weight of theological authority and theological reason as should commend them to the ready acceptance of all right-minded Catholics.

The merely natural qualities and powers of a pure spirit are immeasurably beyond, not only those which we possess, but even beyond what we can clearly comprehend.\* Our spirit, pent up in this corruptible body, this "sack of worms" (as one of the saints called it), is to a very great degree clogged and bowed down by the material mass which it animates and moves. It sees through matter, hears through matter, thinks through matter, knows through matter, acts through matter. Deprive it of only one sense, from its first union with the body; what a sphere of thought, of impression, of action is cut off from it! A child born blind will, under skilful training, learn much of the proper objects of sight. Still, it learns through sense, through what it hears and touches; and, after all, how much remains to know which they who see can know, but which it cannot know! Let a child come into the world with all its senses torpid; put the soul of a S. Thomas or a Suarez into such an ice-bound prison-house, what a world of glorious speculations, of glorious trains of reasoning, lies in germ there frozen for ever! So chained is the soul to the body, that in its influence on external objects it cannot, of its own proper power, affect the smallest of these objects in the smallest degree: it can rise up in imagination to the stars of heaven, to the very throne of the Eternal, but it cannot move a leaf or lift a straw: within its own plastic clay-cage it works at will, but outside the bars of that cage it can do nothing. Not only is it thus hampered in its power of action on outward objects; but even in the exercise of that faculty, which is proper and essential to itself, and which we call understanding or intellect, outside the region of matter, it can rise but little and see but dimly. It is itself a spirit; yet only slowly and painfully from its idea of matter it works its way, by a process

---

\* "*Invisibiles nobis atque incomprehensibiles naturæ.*"—S. Hilary, in Psalm lxiv. n. 10.

of abstraction, to the idea of spirit—an idea, in its positive aspect, still so very imperfect and obscure.\*

Not so a pure spirit or angel.† Called out of the abyss of nothing by the Almighty creating voice, in an instant he springs into being, perfect at once in every attribute of his nature, not needing one moment's time to grow up to his full height of knowledge and power. His intelligence is, of course, limited, but embraces an immense extent of objects, and sees them with penetrating clearness and precision. The whole world is open to his keen glance. He can move from place to place without the least fatigue, and with a rapidity far exceeding that ascribed to the motion of light.‡ His power over matter is very great. He can transfer masses of matter from place to place with inconceivable swiftness: he can separate and combine them, and act on them in an endless variety of ways. He can assume visible forms, and produce sensible effects of the most extraordinary kind, and far surpassing any human power, even the power of immense multitudes of men united together. In attributing these natural powers to angels we believe all theologians of every school are agreed. We shall immediately quote a strong illustration of what we have been saying.

Now, theologians generally, perhaps universally, maintain, after S. Thomas,§ that “the angels who kept not their principality, but forsook their own habitation,” while in their fall losing all grace for ever, yet retained their natural gifts unimpaired. It is indeed true that the visible effects directly and manifestly produced by diabolical agency, especially those exhibited on a stupendous scale, are not so common. But this is so not from want of natural power in the evil spirits, but because they cannot use that power except by divine permission.|| A strong man bound still retains his natural power,

\* “Intellectus noster intelligit materialia abstrahendo a phantasmatis; et per materialia sic considerata in immaterialium aliqualem cognitionem devenimus; sicut e contra Angeli per immaterialia materialia cognoscunt.”—S. Thomas, Summa, P. 1, Q. 85, A. 1, in corp.

† This term is constantly used by theologians simply to signify a pure spirit, abstracting from good or bad.

‡ “Omnis spiritus ales est: hoc angeli et dæmones. Igitur momento ubique sunt: totus orbis illis locus unus est: quid ubique geratur, tam facile sciunt, quam enuntiant. Velocitas divinitas creditur, quia substantia ignoratur.”—Tertullian, Apologeticus, C. 22. See also S. Hilary, in Psalm 118, n. 8, who speaks of the devil as “puncto temporis omnem amplitudinem mundi hujus obeuntem.”

§ Summa, P. 1, Q. 64, A. 1. He speaks here only of the intellectual power of the devils: but his principle clearly applies to their other natural endowments. See Suarez, de Angelis, l. iv., c. 33, n. 10.

|| Suarez, *ibid.*, c. 27, n. 3, 6.

though he cannot use it ; unbind him, and what he then does he does by it. If the devils were allowed to use their power unrestricted, they would destroy the whole human race in the twinkling of an eye, and in many other ways disturb the order of the universe. God has sometimes permitted them to exercise that power within prescribed limits, sometimes for the trial and greater merit of good men, sometimes for the punishment of the wicked.\* Of permissions of the former kind we have many examples in the life of S. Mary above referred to, and in the lives of S. Francis of Assisi, S. Francis Xavier, S. Peter of Alcantara, and others. But we have no example more striking than that recorded in the Bible itself, in the book of Job. Here we have a rapid succession of events indicating extraordinary power ; the Sabeans and Chaldeans driven, like clouds before a tempest, to their work of plunder and slaughter ; torrents of fire rushing down from heaven and consuming the numerous servants and immense flocks of Job ; the strong house, in which his sons and daughters were feasting, levelled to the ground in a moment, and crushing them all to death. It is plain that Satan received no supernatural power, but was simply permitted to use, with certain restrictions, that which he already possessed. It is needless to allude to the numerous other examples of the extraordinary power of devils, which are found in the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. Some of them will be referred to by and by.

But the natural power of the rebel angels, great though it be, is yet less than their malignity. They are altogether evil ; there is in them not only no supernatural goodness, but also no moral goodness ; as we see there is in the wickedest of men, who are capable of some kind acts.† They are not essentially and by their very nature evil ; far from it, God created them good, like all his other creatures. Nay, they were once clothed in the beauty of holiness ; but losing that by their own fault, they lost all goodness. Thenceforward they are for evermore obstinate in evil—confirmed in evil ;

---

\* “Dicit aliquis : cur hoc a Deo permittitur diabolo ? At ego dico, ut boni probentur, improbi puniantur ; hæc enim poena peccati est.” S. Ambrose, in Lucam, l. 6, n. 49.

† Και νυκτωρ και μεθ' ἡμεραν, εμπλανωμενοι τῷ αερι, κακιας εἰσι ποιηται και ὑπηρεται, και τας μεθ' ἡμων επιβουλας ενεργουσι σπουδαιως. Φθονῳ δε και βασκανια τηκονται, κ. τ. λ.—S. Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio de pauperibus amandis* : tom. 3, p. 456, edit. Migne.

“Spiritus nocendi cupidissimos, a justitia penitus alienos, superbia tumidos, invidentia lividos, fallacia callidos.”—S. Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, l. 8, c. 22.



and, for these long six thousand sleepless and unwinking years,\* they have never harboured a single good thought, or done a single good deed; and so it will be for the endless eternity that lies before them and before us all. If they prompt to an act apparently and even in itself good, as they often have done, they mean some purely evil end.† Fresh from the hand of their Creator, so beautiful in their first dawning, so radiant in the young princely glory with which His pure bounty clothed them, they in an instant, and with full deliberation, in rebelling against Him, chose their part at once and for ever—chose it with all the terrible and tenacious energy of which only beings like them are capable. “How art thou fallen from heaven, O day star, who didst rise in the morning!” In an instant the noon of day became the noon of night; that glory was extinguished and vanished like a lightning-flash; and that awful sin at once, like a deadly poison, penetrated their whole being, and commenced to live and work there as it shall live and work there for ever. Its works are pure evil, because it is itself pure evil. These works proceed from that sin as from their primary cause.

That greatest of all sins ‡—that sin so horrible even to think of or to name, the direct and formal hatred of God, is their constant sin. They hate God with all the intensity of their nature, with a pure hatred, with a hatred named from themselves—diabolical. Every moment of their existence they hate Him. They hate His justice, which lies so heavy on themselves; they hate His mercy, which falls on all His creatures, save only the tenants of that dark dungeon. They hate all the blessed in heaven, but with full knowledge that, as against these and against God, this hatred is simply impotent and of no effect. But they not only hate man; they have the power of inflicting on him, while in his state of trial here, the most dreadful evils. They work out, or try to work out our destruction in two ways—directly, by their immediate action upon us; indirectly, by exciting creatures, especially our fellow men,§ to do us mischief. They are ever on the

\* *Αγρυπνων ὁ μιαινος ἐκεῖνος, καὶ μηδεὶς καιρὸν, μηδὲ ὥραν παραλείπων, ἡ ῥαθυμουντων καὶ κοιμωμενων περιγίνεται.* S. Isidore of Pelusium, l. 2, ep. 164.

† “Restat, ut quod possunt, tanquam dæmones possint, vel quasi beneficia præstando magis nocentes, quia magis decipientes; vel aperte maleficiendo.”—S. Augustine, l. c., c. 24, n. 3.

*Σαίνει μὲν τῷ χρηστῷ, τελευτᾷ δὲ εἰς πονηρὸν.*

S. Gregory of Nazian., Orat. 40, n. 10.

‡ S. Thomas, 2, 2, Q. 34, A. 2.

§ “Omnes insidiæ, quascumque nobis spiritales nequitie prætendunt, maxime per homines aptantur.”—S. Hilary, in Psalm. 139, n. 3.

watch to harm us, both in body and soul; but to bring ruin on the soul by luring it into sin—this is the one grand object to which their whole energies are unceasingly directed. It is true that, as regards the infliction of bodily injury, they require a special permission of God, and are rarely permitted to use their direct power. Their *direct* power—for alas we know by an experience too wide and too constant, how heavily the human race is scourged by temporal evils through their *indirect* influence; by private wrongs, inflicted everywhere every day; by the public calamities of revolutions and unjust wars, which they produce by inflaming the worst passions of bad men—their pride, their ambition, their envy, their avarice, their lust. It is also true that, whilst bodily evils—disease, poverty, death—may be inflicted not only against the will but against the wisest precautions of him who suffers them; not all the devils in hell can force a man to sin. They may try the arts of seduction or the arms of terror against him; but before he commits the least deliberate sin, he must first give his own deliberate consent. God has so walled round our free-will, that all “the fiery darts of the most wicked one” cannot reach it until it first surrenders itself. The only death the soul can suffer is the death of mortal sin; and that she must inflict on herself. Sin is essentially suicide. This is true; but it is also true that the war which the demons wage against our souls is incessant, and sometimes terrific; and that many weak ones—who through grace could be strong, if they willed—fall under these assaults, and that the strong often tremble under them, aye, and sometimes fall too.

While it is our duty simply to adore the “incomprehensible judgments” and “unsearchable ways” of God, it is at the same time permitted to collect, chiefly from the analogy of the faith, those views and considerations through which our feeble reason will apprehend, more or less clearly, that divine wisdom which, blending justice and mercy together, “reacheth from end to end mightily, and ordereth all things sweetly.” Hence our theologians have speculated at some length and with much felicity of conception on the reasons for which God permitted this order of things; just as they have speculated on the causes of permitting the fall of the rebel angels and the fall of the human race in Adam. These speculations, given in the compressed form in which they are found in the scholastic writers, would not be sufficiently intelligible except to professed theologians, who already know them, and for whom we are not writing; given in a more expanded form, they would occupy a disproportionate space.

But whatever may have been the reasons existing in the

divine mind for permitting this war of "the spirits of wickedness" against the human race, there can be no doubt as to the fact that he has done so. It is the opinion of several Fathers and Theologians that men never suffer, at least a grievous and pressing temptation to sin, without the devil having some share in it, by kindling the flame, or fanning it, or by both together.\* It is also a very common opinion among theologians that as God has appointed a particular guardian angel for each individual, so the prince of hell has appointed a particular evil spirit for each.† But, before proceeding from these less certain propositions to those of which there can be no reasonable doubt, we would premise a few brief remarks. In the first place, the chief and proper ministry of our good angels is to preserve us from bodily and spiritual harm, to pray for us, to offer our prayers to God, to suggest holy thoughts and affections to us, to combat the evil spirits and restrain their power.‡ In the second place, the devils can use against us only their natural power, and, as has been already observed, within the limits permitted to them. The good angels are endowed with supernatural power, which far more than compensates the lack of natural power in the inferior orders. So that if you suppose a just man using

\* *Ἀρχηγος μεν ουν ἀμαρτιας ὁ διαβολος, και γεννητωρ των κακων . . . . Εκ τουτου μοιχεια, πορνεια, και παν ει τι κακον.*

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis 2, n. 4.

"Non ergo dubites quando aliqui tibi molesti sunt volenti servare justitiam, ministros esse illius nequissimi peccatoris, qui omnium auctor est flagitiorum."—S. Ambrose, in Psalm. 38, n. 6.

"Scit enim auctorem esse principem mundi omnium delictorum. Ipse individuos proximorum stimulis excitatos scindit affectus : ipse flammam accendit libidinis : ipse adolet avaritiæ cupiditates ;" &c. Idem, in Psalm. 118, Sermo 16, n. 12 (in vers. 121).

"Quidquid ergo peccamus, quidquid die et nocte facimus, et malorum operum perpetramus, imperium est dæmonum, qui nunquam nobis dant requiem, sed semper impellunt delictis augere delicta, et cumulum facere peccatorum."—S. Jerome, in Jeremiah, xvi. 13.

† Suarez leans very decidedly to the two opinions mentioned above ; and the reasoning by which he supports the second appears to us very strong in favour of both (l. 8, c. 21, n. 31) :—"Estque hæc assertio valde credibilis ex dictis : nam Lucifer æmulatur divinitatem, et cum Deo super salutem hominum apertum bellum profitetur. . . . Nec est ulla ratio dubitandi de voluntate, si potestas illi non desit : duo autem requiruntur ad potestatem : unum est, quod numerus militum suppetat ; aliud, quod Deus permittat. De hoc posteriori non est quod dubitemus," &c.

‡ Justly does Billuart, after enumerating the offices of the guardian angels, exclaim, "Et cum tot ac tanta beneficia ab angelis custodibus continuo recipiamus, eo usque ingrati sumus, ut tam insignium benefactorum, quod speciali cultu et honore prosequi deceret, vix memoriam recolamus."—D. 8, A. 3, Petes 3.

all the necessary means of grace ; if you suppose him grievously assaulted by a devil who once belonged to the highest order of the angelic quires, and protected only by a guardian angel belonging to the lowest, this angel, though far inferior in natural power to the opposing fiend, will be able utterly to defeat and beat him down, though backed by whole legions of his infernal peers. In the third place, it is clear from the Scriptures,\* to say nothing of other authorities, that there is one evil spirit, the prince and ruler of all the rest, who is called by way of pre-eminence “the devil ;” hence we read of “the devil and *his* angels.”† This spirit was, before his fall, if not the very highest angel, and above all the rest, at least one of the highest order.‡ His natural power must therefore be exceeding great. He it was who tempted Eve in Paradise, and tempted our Lord in the desert. It is a very probable opinion § that, at the time of our Saviour’s death on the cross, this “dragon, the old serpent,” was cast down into hell, to remain confined there, without any power of egress, till the last persecution of the Church under Antichrist. Notwithstanding the appalling havoc which infidelity, and heresy, and revolution, and sin of every kind are making, in these our evil days throughout Christendom, we may well thank God that He has not reserved us for those far more evil days, when this terrible spirit will again “be loosed a little time.”

But to resume. The saddest and most awful instance of the combined power and malice of the devil, among all recorded in the Bible, is that which is recorded the very first. The narrative of the inspired writer is brief, but deeply absorbing. It is the tragedy of the human race. To read it thoughtfully, and with a vivid image of the whole scene before the mind’s eye, stops the breath and pierces or rather crushes the heart with a feeling of overwhelming agony and desolation. How tremendous the issue that trembled in the

\* “Hoc vero quod de uno principe dixi, certissimum est ob Scripturæ testimonia.”—Suarez, l. 8, c. 21, n. 5. † Matthew xxv. 41.

‡

‘Ο μὲν πρατιστος ἐν οὐρανοῖς φαεσσιν  
Ἦς ὑπεροπλῖσι φαιος καὶ κυδος ολεσσας,  
Αἰὲν ἀπεχθαίρει μεροπῶν γένος.

S. Gregory Nazianz. Carminum l. 1, v. 46, &c.

Suarez (l. 7, c. 15, n. 10), in accordance with an opinion which he holds on another question, makes him among the highest, with equals but without a superior. S. Thomas (Q. 63, A. 7) holds it as more probable that he was the highest of all. Sylvius (ibid.) affirms that this is “communis scholasticorum doctrina.”

§ “Valde probabile.”—Suarez, l. 8, c. 17, n. 10. See A Lapidé on Apocalypse, xx. 2, and Petavius de Angelis, l. 3, c. 4, n. 10.

balance of that dialogue between the serpent and the woman, between the woman and the man—the triumph or the fall, the eternal glory or the eternal ruin of so many millions of human beings ! Then, such happiness so quickly followed by such a doom ! Our first parents were created in a state of unspeakable perfection, both in soul and body ; exempt from sickness, from all pain whatever, from decay and death—exempt from all involuntary emotion, with every appetite absolutely subject to the dominion of reason ; with ample and unclouded knowledge ; and, greatest gift of all, clothed in spotless innocence and grace. The arch-fiend, burning with envy, hatred, revenge, pride, prepared the trial of his skill against the happy pair ; and so great was that skill, so deep that infernal craft, so keen that infernal sagacity, that he succeeded at once in fully accomplishing his design. He conquered, and Adam and all Adam's posterity fell under his power. Then commenced that deadly war carried on incessantly to the end of time.

By the victory of the second Adam the power of the evil spirits is in many ways greatly restrained, especially among the faithful. From the daily sacrifice ; from the constant use of the sacraments ; from the exercise of the spiritual powers confided to the Church, in teaching, governing, binding and loosing, blessing and exorcising ; from the prayers and merits of the departed saints ; from the prayers and merits of living saints, with which the Church militant always abounds, and which make her always an image of the Church triumphant ; from the special protection of the guardian angels and especially of the Queen of all the angels ; from the outpourings of the Holy Spirit, who always abides in her, never for one moment deserting her—from all these sources is the Church flooded with perennial streams of grace, imparting to her beauty and strength, and thereby enfeebling the energies of her invisible foes. Still these energies are very great.

They are very great. We learn this from clear and decisive testimonies of Scripture. We find, after the Ascension of our Lord and the descent of the Holy Ghost, numerous cases of persons possessed, or otherwise tortured, by devils. S. Peter cures persons troubled with unclean spirits : S. Philip does the same. S. Paul exorcises a girl possessed with a devil, and “who brought her masters much gain by *divining*.” On one occasion a demoniac nearly killed two men, who attempted to exorcise her without having authority.\* One of the most dangerous of all temptations—in one sense, we should say,

---

\* Acts v. 16 ; viii. 7 ; xvi. 16–18 ; xix. 13–16.

the *most* dangerous—is spiritual delusion. To this temptation S. Paul alludes—or, rather, describes it with one vivid touch—when he tells us that “Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel of light.\*” Spiritual writers tell us that many, even of those who had embraced a state of perfection, have been grievously deceived by this most subtle temptation. We have in our own day, for example, in the revival tumults and convictions of sin among the Methodists, manifest instances of the wide-spread influence of this devilish hallucination. It is a fearful snare, not only because so many are caught in it; but because, from its peculiar nature, it is so hard for those who are caught to escape. In the Catholic Church, and in her alone, is to be found the sure and specific remedy—spiritual direction submitted to with profound humility and obedience.

We have, in the same Epistle of S. Paul, a striking and most instructive example of the envenomed pertinacity and power of the devil, and at the same time of his utter impotence against those who use in their own defence the weapons which God has placed mediately or immediately in the hands of all the faithful. There are few passages, even in the writings of this great Apostle, more moving than that, in which, after mentioning the visions and revelations that were communicated to him when he was caught up to the third heaven, he adds:—“And lest the greatness of the revelation should lift me up, there was given me a sting of the flesh, an angel of Satan to buffet me. For which thing I thrice besought the Lord that it might depart from me; and he said to me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for power is made perfect in infirmity.”† Whatever may be the nature of the suffering to which S. Paul was subjected, it is evident that it was inflicted by the devil; for this is expressly stated in the text. It is also evident that the trial was severe. (a) As the revelation that might have occasioned pride in him was great, so the corresponding trial, that was to secure his humility, should have been no slight one. (b) The same is indicated by the metaphors of “stinging” ‡ and “buffeting,” which are used to describe the trial; (c) also by the earnestness of S. Paul’s prayer for deliverance; (d) and by the signal manifestation of the triumph of Divine grace in weak nature.

Even at the risk of tasking too far the patience of our readers, we cannot pass over one other very significant passage in the writings of S. Paul. We give it in full:—

\* 2 Cor. xi. 14.

† 2 Cor. xii. 7–9.

‡ “Σκολοψ τῇ σαρκί, *a thorn in the flesh*, something which excites severe and constant pain.”—Robinson, in voc.



“Finally, brethren, be strengthened in the Lord, and in the power of His might. Put you on the armour of God, that you may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers: against the rulers of the world of this darkness; against the spirits of wickedness in the high places.\* Wherefore take unto you the armour of God, that you may be able to resist in the evil day, and to stand in all things perfect. Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast-plate of justice, and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace: in all things taking the shield of faith, wherewith you may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one. And take unto you the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.”†

Whether S. Paul meant here to speak of the wrestling against evil spirits *exclusively*, or of that wrestling as *super-added* to the other against flesh and blood,‡ one thing, at least, is plain, namely, that he represents the attacks of the devils upon us as of the most appalling kind. This is clear (a) from the strong and accumulative epithets which he uses in describing them and their assaults, “principalities,” “powers,” “fiery darts,” &c.; (b) also from the contrast he draws between the force of diabolical assaults and of those that are merely human—as if the latter were comparatively of no moment; (c) also from the completeness of the preparation necessary to overcome these assaults: the soldier of Christ must be not only well armed for the spiritual combat, he must be fully armed, must put on the *whole* armour of God.§ Then, as if to signify the strong, the absolute necessity of this complete equipment, he presses the comparison of the full armed soldier graphically into all its details. In a word, he plainly signifies that the attacks of the devil are so terrific,

\* That is, according to the more received interpretation, “in the air, over us.” See on the whole of this passage the very able and learned commentary on “The Epistles and Gospels of the Sundays throughout the Year,” by Dr. M’Carthy of Maynooth College.

† Ephes. vi. 10–17.

‡ The true meaning is that adopted by A. Lapide and other Catholic commentators, and followed by Alford and other Protestant commentators:—“Our wrestling is *not* against man, who, consisting of flesh and blood, is a weak adversary, but against devils, who, as being pure spirits, unencumbered with flesh and blood, as being most malicious, &c. &c., are immeasurably more dangerous.” Of course we have to struggle, as we have said, against men excited and aided by devils; but our fight is then really against devils, who, using men as their instruments, are our real assailants.

§ Την πανοπλιαν του Θεου.

that, to secure the victory in this life-long conflict, we shall need to use vigorously every spiritual weapon which God has put into our hands or within our reach. Why, as we ponder over this wonderful passage and realize its imagery to our minds, we seem to behold the very conflict itself. We see the princes of hell arrayed in serried rank, and blackening the air around—we see the deep, red glare of deadly hate in their cruel eyes—we see the feline stealth with which they move about, watching for an unguarded moment—we see the bow full bent—we hear the hiss of the fiery arrow, winged with all the precision of a demon's eye, with all the nerve of a demon's arm. Then our eyes fall on the brave soldier of Christ, perhaps some beardless youth—we see him cased in his glorious armour—we hear the ring of the arrow rebounding from his burnished shield—we see the flashing sword lifted up, and falling on the conquered host—we hear their retreating yell of baffled rage—we see a glow of heavenly joy beaming in the eye of the guardian angel—and the glad *Te Deum* rises unbidden to our lips.

Out of the many other Scriptural illustrations, which we might produce, we shall content ourselves with one, taken from the first Epistle of S. Peter, in which he thus admonishes the faithful of the particular churches to which the Epistle is addressed:—"Be sober, and watch: because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about, seeking whom he may devour."\* The "roaring lion" is represented everywhere in Scripture as the most vivid type of overwhelming strength and terror combined.† This image, in itself sufficiently dreadful, S. Peter intensifies by the additional circumstances of activity in searching for his prey ("goeth about"), of his eagerness to seize it ("seeking"), and of his pitiless and unsparing cruelty towards it ("devour"). In picturing to our minds the lions devouring the accusers of the prophet Daniel,‡ or the scenes in the Coliseum, where so many Christian martyrs were torn in pieces by wild beasts, we shrink with an involuntary emotion of horror. But in contemplating this dread fiend, not as a picture of the imagination, but as really though invisibly before us, and ready to spring upon us with the strength and fury of ten thousand lions, we can only exclaim with the prophet, "the mercies of the Lord that we are not consumed."§

It is plain that the Apostles speak of these diabolical

---

\* 1 Pet. v. 8.

† Psalm xxi. 14; Isai. v. 29; xxxi. 4; Ezech. xxii. 25; &c. &c.

‡ Dan. vi. 24.

§ Lament. iii. 22.

influences, not as peculiar to their own age, but as belonging to the normal condition of the Church, and to be exercised within her pale as without it to the end of time. Indeed, S. Peter, immediately after the words quoted above, adds the following:—"Whom resist ye, strong in the faith; knowing that the same affliction befalls your brethren who are in the world"—just as if he had said, "The assaults to which you are exposed from the invisible foe are not confined to you; they are the common lot of all." We should therefore expect, *à priori*, what the history of every age abundantly testifies, and what the numerous exorcisms\* and other prayers of the Church necessarily suppose, the constant and energetic interference of devils in the affairs of men. For our Catholic readers it were quite superfluous to crowd our pages with references to authorities. Indeed, knowing as we do how immense is the power of the evil spirits, how insatiable their malice,† how unwearied their activity, we need but look around us on the world of our own days to see the unmistakable evidences of their agency in the gigantic crimes which wicked kings and wicked ministers of State, and other wicked men, have for the last twenty years committed against all laws, human and Divine. If it was by the devil that David was moved to commit a sin, which brought down such a heavy scourge on the people; that Judas was led to betray our Lord; that S. Paul was once and again hindered from visiting the church of the Thessalonians; if, but for the special prayer of Christ, he would have sifted the Apostle as wheat;‡ there is no rashness in tracing similar operations to the same exciting or co-operating cause. If the hand of God—constantly strengthening, defending, reviving—be to the eye of faith visible in the history of the Church and of the Holy See in every age; not less visible is the impress of that other, the destroying and polluting hand, in the history of that same Church and See, and of the whole human race. We are tempted to give living illustrations; but our thoughtful reader will need no help from us in finding them out—they lie before his eyes on the open page of the world's news.

But there is one species of diabolical agency, of a very subtle and insidious nature, which has of late years appeared, or rather, as we shall see hereafter, re-appeared on the world's stage, arresting the attention and exercising the tongues and pens of cultivated men and women, Christian and non-

---

\* See further on the extracts from the Roman Ritual.

† *Ἀπληστος ἐστίν, εἰς πάντα ἐπερχεται*.—Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 40, l. c.

‡ 1 Paralip. xxi. 1, 14; Luke xxii. 3; 1 Thessal. ii. 18; Luke xxii. 31.

Christian, throughout the old world and the new.\* The nomenclature of the various phenomena in which this agency manifests itself is far from clear or precise. They would come partly under the head of divination, partly under the head of black magic. By divination theologians understand the seeking for a *knowledge* of hidden things through the aid of the devil. By black magic (called also the black-art, distinguished from white or natural magic) they understand the art of producing super-human *effects* through the same aid. We shall by and by state in detail the phenomena alluded to.

It is only with the theological aspect of the subject that we are now concerned; and on this F. Perrone's volume has thrown a far clearer and fuller light than any other that has come in our way. Indeed, his work is the only one known to us, in which the subject is treated at once with fulness of detail, and at the same time with strict adherence to that rigid scholastic system of scientific arrangement and argument, which is beyond comparison the surest test of sound and unsound reasoning ever known among men. But what stamps on the learned Father's work quite a peculiar, we had almost said quite a decisive, weight of authority, is that he professes to follow as his guides the very best Catholic writers who have more recently devoted themselves to the study of the subject.† Of works of this kind he names nearly a score, among them the "*Civiltà Cattolica*," from about a dozen different authors, French, German, and Italian, besides others whom he quotes in the course of his dissertation. We may mention here that the only theologians of mark known to us, who have written quite recently on the subject, have come to the same general conclusions—the late F. Gury and the present professor of Moral Theology in the Roman College, F. Ballerini, in his valuable annotations on Gury. Indeed, we rather believe that F. Perrone represents substantially the theological judgment of the day. Of one thing we have no doubt whatever, namely, that, if the mass of materials which have been brought together with so much conscientious labour, had existed in the days of the great old theologians, they would with one accord have come to the conclusions adopted by him.

Having premised thus much on the weight of the evidence

\* F. Perrone informs us (n. 402, note) that, independent of pamphlets and articles in periodicals, upwards of *two thousand* volumes have been published on the subject by American, English, French, German, and Italian authors alone.

† "*Optimos quosque auctores, qui novissime hoc de argumento commentaria ediderunt, duces sequemur.*"—Pag. 158, n. 405.

which F. Perrone has collected and digested, we proceed to lay before our readers the doctrines maintained by our author, in all of which our own convinced reason fully concurs; together with a selection from the arguments on which those doctrines are based. We on a former occasion\* presented our readers with a brief sketch of the characteristics of F. Perrone's theology: of the present volume we have nothing new to say; it has the genuine stamp and ring of the old metal.

The phenomena of modern devil-worship—for such it really is†—have, according to our author, passed, since their first introduction, through three phases, and may therefore be reduced to three classes; which, when viewed as mere phenomena, and as they strike the senses (viewed physically, as the scholastics would phrase it), seem to be of distinct species, but viewed morally, are all of the same species, and differ only in degree.‡ The first of these is called animal magnetism or mesmerism, from the name of the author, Anthony Mesmer, an Austrian physician, who first gave it to the public in the year 1773. The second is called artificial somnambulism. The third comprises the phenomena of table-turning, table-rapping or table-speaking, and the direct evocation of spirits.§ The whole three, especially the first and second, are often called by the common name of animal magnetism or mesmerism.

Mesmerism was first heralded forth as a mere curative agency. The mesmeriser uses certain gesticulations, generally passes of the hand, for the most part horizontal but sometimes vertical, opposite or near the diseased part of the subject's body. The cure, if effected, is supposed to be caused by a magnetic fluid proceeding from the mesmeriser, or excited in the mesmerised, which some call electrical, others ethereal, others odyc, &c. If, as F. Perrone observes|| the matter had proceeded no further, there might, perhaps, be no great difficulty in accounting for all this. But an ulterior development of phenomena rapidly, and it would seem consequentially, displayed themselves. The first of these is the *simple* magnetic sleep, in which the subject is reduced to a state of perfect catalepsy, from which no sound however loud can waken him,

\* In our number for January, 1866, p. 268.

† Οἰωνοσκοπία, μαντεία, κληδονισμοί, ἡ περιὰμματα, ἡ ἐν πεταλοῖς ἐπιγραφὰι, μαγείαι, ἡ ἀλλὰ κακοτεχνίαι, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, λατρεῖαι εἰσι διαβόλου. — S. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis 19, n. 8.

‡ Perrone, n. 666. To avoid useless repetition, we shall in future simply refer to the number of the paragraph.

§ N. 401.

|| N. 421, note.

and in which he is insensible to all pain whatsoever, such, for example, as that inflicted by incisions in the flesh, the application of red-hot iron, &c. As the phenomena of this class are mere trifles compared with those of the second and third class,\* we shall say nothing here of their *source*; as to the *lawfulness* of allowing oneself to be put into such a state, we must refer our readers to Moral Theology.†

Artificial Somnambulism, called also the Magnetic Sleep and Sleep-waking, is also produced by certain gestures of the mesmeriser. The subject in this state is entirely insensible to everything passing around him, but is at the same time under the absolute control of the operator, who can communicate his own wishes to him, not only by words and signs, but by a simple act of the will. The senses are affected in a most extraordinary way, and the mind is raised to a height of intelligence quite preternatural both in its penetration and compass.

Thus, the *senses* are so acted upon that, at the command of the operator, objects existing far beyond the sphere of vision, or not existing at all, are seen clearly, while others lying visibly before the eyes are not seen—sensations of pain or pleasure are felt, no instrument whatever having been applied to cause these sensations—odours, as of this or that flower, are smelled, no such odoriferous object being present—printing is read with the eyes closed and bandaged—an accurate description is given of what is at the moment passing in some distant place; for example, in a closed room several miles away, the number and names of persons present, their occupation, conversation, and so forth. All these phenomena have been designated by the general name of Clair-voyance, and the subject is called a Clair-voyant. To these must be added the phenomena of Magnetic Attraction, by which the operator irresistibly draws the subject to himself, however unwilling the latter may be, or even raises him in the air; and of Interchange of Senses, as when one sees with the back of the head, or hears with the feet.‡

But the *intellectual* phenomena are of a still more extraordinary character. F. Perrone arranges them under six heads or degrees—quoting in this case, as in every other, numerous authorities of unquestionable weight. 1. The somnambulist sees the secret thoughts of others, though not intimated by any external signs; he obeys commands given only mentally, and even carries on a mental conversation.

\* N. 475.

† See Ballerini, vol. i. p. 283.

‡ N. 426, 432-3.



2. He gets an extraordinary faculty of reasoning and memory, together with a knowledge of the higher philosophical science, of which he previously knew nothing. This has occurred even to persons quite uncultivated. 3. Though ignorant of the science of therapeutics, he receives a knowledge which enables him to prescribe suitable remedies for bodily ailments. 4. He communicates various sensations, even to those who are absent. 5. He predicts future events depending upon free and contingent causes. 6. He acquires a knowledge of strange tongues which he never knew before. Add to these the Magnetic Extasies, of which the highest is that in which he receives apparitions of departed souls, Angels, the Blessed Virgin, the infant Jesus, and others.\*

The third class of phenomena had its origin in the United States of America, as to its first appearances, about thirty-five years ago; as to further developments, more recently. They are designated by the general name of Spiritualism, or (more properly, we think) Spiritism. It would far exceed our limits to give, even briefly, a detailed account of them; for this and for their classification we can only refer to our author.† The chief difference, beside the mode of operation, between the phenomena of the second and third class is that the former are in the subject, the latter external to him. This difference is, however, purely extrinsic and accidental; that Sleep-waking and Spiritism are in substance one and the same the defenders of both not only admit but maintain.‡

The phenomena of this third class are divided into *mechanical* and *significant*. We confine ourselves to the latter; but we shall first present our readers with a couple of instances of the former, extracted from the work quoted in the note below:—

A gentleman, who had been expressing himself in a very sceptical manner, not only with reference to spirit manifestations, but on the subject of spiritual existence generally, sat on a sofa two or three feet from the dining-room table, round which we [to the number of eight or nine] were placed. After sitting some time, we were directed by the rapping to join hands and stand up round the table *without touching it*. All did so for a quarter of an hour, wondering whether anything would happen, or whether we were hoaxed by the unseen power. Just as one or two of the party talked of sitting down,

\* N. 435–7.

† N. 667–80.

‡ N. 665–6. “Though a kind of resemblance between the mesmeric and spiritual phenomena could not escape notice when our experiments were first made, I had no idea whatever of the real connection between the two processes, nor of the nearness to identity of the agencies employed.”—*From Matter to Spirit*, ch. 5, v. 52.

the old table, which was large enough for eight or ten persons, after the manner of a lodging-house, moved entirely by itself as we surrounded and followed it with our hands joined, went towards the gentleman out of the circle, and literally pushed him up to the back of the sofa, till he called out, "Hold, enough!"

Of the marvels in the way of table-moving, &c., occurring in Mr. Home's \* presence, his own account, corroborated by so many witnesses, speaks with sufficient detail. In referring to his very powerful mediumship,† I only add one to the number of persons by whom the facts are attested. It is only in Mr. Home's presence that I have witnessed that very curious appearance or process, the *thrilling* of the table. This takes place for some seconds, perhaps more, before it rises from the floor. The last time I witnessed this phenomenon . . . when it [the thrilling] ceased, the table rose more than two feet from the floor (p. 26).

The significant phenomena, so called from their communicating knowledge of things secret or unknown, were at first displayed in the spontaneous rapping of the legs of tables, hence called table-rapping; then in raps made by other objects, or by invisible agency, hence called by the more general name of spirit-rapping. A second kind of these phenomena occurs when the hand of the medium is directed to the letters of the alphabet, which form the words by which the required information is conveyed. The third, when the hand of the medium is moved to write the words themselves. The fourth, when the words are written without the intervention of any human action whatever.

We will now give two examples of table-rapping in the early years of its existence; they are taken from the works of two English Protestant clergymen, Messrs. Godfrey & Gillson, published in London in 1853. We copy them from the September number of the *Quarterly Review* of the same year.

Mr. Godfrey says, "I now said, 'if there be a hell, I command you to knock on the floor with this leg twice;' it was motionless. 'If there be not a hell, knock twice;' no answer. 'If there be a devil, knock twice;' no answer. 'If there be not a devil, knock twice;' to our horror, the leg slowly rose and knocked twice."

The same on another occasion; "'Are you sorry now for the sins you committed when alive?' 'Yes,' very emphatically. . . . 'Does God compel you to answer questions?' 'Yes.' 'Do you like to answer me?' 'Yes,' very emphatically. 'Shall you be sorry when you leave here?' 'Yes.' 'Are

---

\* See our number for April, 1864, Art. 7.

† Those are called *mediums* in whose presence only, or at whose bidding, the phenomena of Spiritism will occur.

you happier in the presence of God's people [the present company]?' 'Yes,' *decidedly.*"\*

Mr. Gillson says, "I inquired, 'Are you a departed spirit?' The answer was 'Yes,' indicated by a rap. . . . 'Do you know Satan?' 'Yes.' . . . 'How long will it be before he is cast out?' He rapped *ten.* . . . I then asked 'Where are Satan's head-quarters? Are they in England?' There was a slight movement. 'Are they in France?' A violent movement. 'Are they in Spain?' Similar agitation. 'Are they at Rome?' *The table literally seemed frantic.* . . . 'How many spirits have been in the table this evening?' 'Four.' This spirit informed us that he had been an infidel, and that he embraced Popery about five years before his death. Amongst other questions he was asked, 'Do you know the Pope?' *The table was violently agitated.* I asked, 'How long will Popery continue?' He rapped *ten*; exactly coinciding with the other spirit's account of the binding of Satan."

Two questions at once suggest themselves in reference to these extraordinary phenomena. The first is, Are the facts real? Are the accounts of them perfectly trustworthy? At the period when the article in the *Quarterly Review*, above referred to, was written, the reality of the phenomena of Spiritism was denied by many able men, Catholic as well as non-Catholic. The writer of that article ascribes them all to "the possession of the mind by a *dominant idea*, from which it makes no sufficient effort to free itself."† Since that time, however, evidence has accumulated on all sides—so continuous, so multiplied, in every way so overwhelming, that, as F. Perrone affirms, no doubt is any longer entertained on the subject; and he accordingly enters into no proof, simply referring to writers in whose productions the testimonies are given at full length.‡ The evidence for Spiritism is, he tells us, more notorious and more unassailable than that for magnetism: he gives the latter in a compressed form, together with answers—and conclusive answers they are—to the arguments on the opposite side. He gives a selection from the names of several eminent persons, lay and clerical, among the latter Lacordaire, Sibour (the late Archbishop of Paris), the late Cardinal Gousset, &c., on whose minds a full conviction had been wrought. Of course there have been in this, as in most other matters, cases of jugglery, exaggerated cases, doubtful cases: but the innumerable cases that have

---

\* N. 669.

† P. 510, 557.

‡ N. 661, note, n. 680 and note.

stood unscathed the severest test are no more affected by these than are the established facts of history by the many fables that assume the name of history. The invariable law of a plausible lie is this—let it be received at first with open arms; intelligent men, who have no interest in supporting it and no prejudice in favour of it, pause and inquire; as time flows on, it gradually, and, as it were, day by day loses its hold on the credence of men, and at length vanishes utterly and for ever. The very opposite of this has been the fortune of the phenomena we are speaking of. Among men of keen and cultivated minds they were at first received, not only with disbelief, but with laughter and derision: they were rejected as untrue, not because not proven, but because incapable of proof, because they were impossible—and, indeed, impossible they are, as we shall see, to mere human power and skill. Among the characteristics of the world in modern times a tendency to believe in the preternatural most certainly can *not* be reckoned. The phenomena of Magnetism and Spiritism at least *appear* preternatural: the predisposition was dead against accepting them: it was predicted that, before the generation that witnessed their rise had died out, they would have disappeared and been forgotten. Well, years have rolled on, and men who formerly would not without impatience read or listen to the accounts of these phenomena (the present writer was one of these), had at length been led to examine what was making such a noise in the world, and from mature, and for a time prejudiced, examination, have been led to conviction. In this way have been brought round several of the ablest and most learned men in Europe, Catholic theologians, physicians, and philosophers and others, Catholic, Protestant, and free-thinking. Authority does not necessarily, nor even generally, prove an opinion: in a matter of mere opinion the most inquiring and cautious men may be greatly deceived, and have been so deceived. But here there is question of facts and of the testimony of the senses—of facts sensible to the sight, the hearing, the touch—of facts and testimonies repeated over and over again, beyond the possibility of calculation, in the greater part of Europe and America, and recorded year after year down to the present day. It is quite impossible that about such facts such a cloud of such witnesses should be all deceived.

Add to this the language of the Encyclical of the Roman Inquisition; quoted by and by, clearly implying the true existence of the magnetic phenomena:—"It is known for certain that a new kind of superstition has been introduced from magnetic phenomena." The same document refers also

to "the statements of trustworthy men on all sides regarding the experiments of magnetism."\*

The reality of the phenomena being supposed, the second question is, By what agency are they produced? The answer to this question occupies a large proportion of F. Perrone's dissertation, and is throughout arranged with admirable method and elaborated with the greatest clearness and force of reasoning. The various hypotheses having been briefly stated,† the reader is conducted through a series of negative positions, each supported by an unanswerable array of argument, until he finds himself at the ultimate and inevitable conclusion. From first to last there are evident marks of the dominant love of truth and justice, of the courage to go as far as reason or authority leads, and the caution not to go one inch farther. We regret that we can do little more than state the conclusions at which the author arrives—requesting our readers to bear in mind that, as has been already stated, he distinctly and emphatically offers his work as but an abridged digest of other voluminous productions that had preceded him.

His first proposition is that, though some of the physiological phenomena of animal magnetism and somnambulism, viewed in themselves and apart from accompanying adjuncts, may be ascribed to material natural causes, most of them, or the whole taken in the aggregate, can by no means be referred to such a source. This, however, must be absolutely and universally affirmed of the intellectual or psychological phenomena enumerated above. To refer them, as some do, to unknown laws of nature is extremely unphilosophical and absurd; for they clearly contradict laws of nature that are certain and universally known. For example, it is a law of our nature that we cannot read with the eyes closed and bandaged, that we cannot speak a language we never learned, &c.

The second proposition affirms that all the mesmeric phenomena cannot be produced by physiological natural causes. This proposition chiefly regards the psychological phenomena of magnetic somnambulism; and the hypotheses which it assails are all purely gratuitous, and for the most part are conveyed in words which express ideas that have no corresponding realities.

The third proposition is that the human will, whether immediately by itself or by the motive power of the soul,‡

\* N. 625.

† N. 469.

‡ "Vis motrix," the power which the soul has of executing, through the

cannot be the physical cause of the mesmeric phenomena, but only the moral and mediate cause.

Some of the terms of this proposition, perfectly clear and precise to one versed in Catholic theology and philosophy, are not so to the uninitiated. F. Perrone, after giving a succinct exposition himself, refers for a fuller one to an article in the "*Civiltà Cattolica*," which itself professes to be but an abridgment of a much longer essay by Monticelli, a learned Italian writer, to whom our author frequently refers: on the present matter he also refers to Suarez and the late lamented F. Tongiorgi. One of the sources of difficulty in accurately understanding philosophical terms is that the philosophical and the popular sense are often widely different, and also that the same term has sometimes different senses in different departments of philosophy. In philosophy, an immediate cause is that which produces the effect directly by itself, without the aid of any means distinct from itself; a mediate cause is that which produces the effect through the aid of means, active or passive, distinct from itself. Thus, if a man drives a carriage or rows a boat, the horse and the oar are the immediate causes of the motion of the carriage and the boat; the driver and the rower are the mediate causes. A physical cause is that which produces the effect by its own proper power; a moral cause is that whose own proper power neither produces the effect nor helps in producing it. A physical cause may be mediate as well as immediate; a moral cause is necessarily mediate. If I drive a carriage, I am the physical, though mediate cause of the motion; if I ask, hire, command, &c., another to drive for me, I am the moral cause of the motion, I do not help or concur in producing it. As the moral cause does not act by physical agency, hence the physical cause on which it acts must be an intelligent being: for the moral cause can act on the physical cause only through the intelligence of the latter; a cause without intelligence cannot be influenced by a prayer, a menace, a command, &c.\*

Having laid down these definitions, and deduced from them certain corollaries, our author proceeds to refute by several arguments † a favourite theory of the magnetologists, namely, that the magnetizer by a simple act of his will directly and immediately *causes* the mesmeric phenomena. The radical and fatal error of this theory is that it confounds *to will* and *to*

---

instrumentality of the muscles, the behests of the will. Thus, if I will to close my hand, I thereby will that my soul should exercise the power she has of contracting the muscles of my hand.

\* N. 526.

† N. 528-542.



do. As was remarked in the early part of this article, the soul can act as a physical cause within its own body, but outside that it cannot immediately and by itself do anything whatever.

The fourth proposition affirms that the proximate cause of the magnetic phenomena is an intelligent and free being, distinct from the human soul.

This proposition is little else than a corollary from the preceding. As the magnetizer cannot produce the phenomena by material or physiological agency or by an act of his will, and as he brings them about by some agency, it follows that he must produce them as a moral cause—there being no conceivable intermediate hypothesis. Now a moral cause can act only on an intelligent and free being; this being is not the soul of the mesmerizer or the mesmerized; it must, therefore, be some intelligence distinct from the human soul.\* This proposition is now admitted by several magnetologists.†

The fifth proposition affirms that the aforesaid cause is of its own nature higher than the human soul, and preternatural. This, too, is but a corollary of the preceding. For as an intelligent being distinct from man is the cause, and as the phenomena far surpass human power, and belong to an order of action quite different from that to which human power is limited, the proposition follows as a necessary sequence.

The sixth and seventh propositions affirm that good angels cannot be the cause of these phenomena; of which no other cause can be admitted save bad angels or devils.

F. Perrone proves these two propositions distinctly and apart, and by two distinct series of arguments. His direct proof of the diabolical agency comprises five heads of evidence: 1, from the nature of the phenomena; 2, from the effects; 3, from the mode in which mesmerism operates; 4, from the evident malice and wickedness of the principal agent, who often utters doctrines of the most blasphemous and anti-christian character; 5, from the open or implied admission of not a few magnetizers themselves.

At the close of his volume, F. Perrone gives two admirable chapters; in one of which he shows that Animal Magnetism, Somnambulism, and Spiritism are simply a revival of the public superstition of paganism, and the concealed superstition of the middle ages, and an attempt to restore the empire of

\* n. 547, &c.

† As by the authoress of "From Matter to Spirit," and by the author of the preface to the same work, p. xxvi., 96. See Perrone, n. 567-8.

the devil among men ; in the other he points out the many and striking points of opposition between the diabolical phenomena and the genuine miracles recorded in the Bible and in the lives of the saints. We can do no more here than indicate these two chapters, and assure our readers that they greatly merit, and will amply repay a diligent perusal.\* We also mention them, because we think they contain at least one distinct and very powerful argument for the present propositions.

There is also a very strong argument from a passage in the Roman Ritual. In the introduction to the exorcisms appointed to be read over persons harrassed by the devil, the following words occur :—" In the first place let him [the Exorcist] not readily believe that any one is infested by the devil ; but let him know well the signs that distinguish an infested person from those who are labouring under melancholy or disease. The signs of demoniacal obsession are, to speak much in an unknown tongue—to disclose distant and hidden things—to show strength above one's years or constitution, and such like, which, when many of them occur together, are a stronger indication." The " Ritual " then mentions several ways in which the devil tries to delude the exorcist, and concludes thus :—" In a word, the artifices and frauds which the devil uses to deceive men are endless, and the Exorcist should take care not to be caught by them." † We subjoin in a note some extracts from an Encyclical addressed, in the year 1856, by the Roman Inquisition to all the Bishops of the Church.‡

\* We must not omit a remark (n. 815), which we remember to have seen many years ago advanced in some book as a kind of discovery, but which has been long since put forward by the Fathers, and by very early Fathers, too. The remark is, that the devil is constantly engaged in trying to imitate what God has instituted for our sanctification, and in his simious way to get up a rival worship of his own. This is a key for more than one apparently serious difficulty.

† In primis, ne facile credat, aliquem a dæmonio obsessum esse ; sed nata habeat ea signa, quibus obsessus dignoscitur ab iis, qui vel atra bile, vel morbo aliquo laborant. Signa autem obsidentis dæmonis sunt : ignota lingua loqui pluribus verbis, vel loquentem intelligere : Distantia, et occulta patefacere : vires supra ætatis, seu conditionis naturam ostendere ; et id genus alia, quæ cum plurima concurrunt, majora sunt indicia. . . . Denique innumerabiles sunt artes et fraudes diaboli ad decipiendum hominem, quibus ne fallatur, Exorcista cautus esse debet.

‡ Compertum est, novum quoddam superstitionis genus invehi ex phænomenis magneticis, quibus haud scientiis physicis enucleandis, ut par esset, sed decipiendis ac seducendis hominibus student neoterici plures, rati, posse occulta, remota ac futura detegi magnetismi arte vel præstigio, præsertim ope muliercularum, quæ unice a magnetizatoris nutu pendent. . . .

In the section on the character and source of Spiritism, our author adopts substantially the same method as in the preceding; but the evidences of both being so very direct and clear and decisive, he justly has not thought it necessary to approach his final conclusion by such cautious and measured steps, but rather seizes it at a single bound.

In the first proposition—which was needed only for mere form's sake—he shows that the efficient cause of the phenomena of Spiritism is not and cannot be natural, but is altogether preternatural. To our Catholic readers bearing in mind what these phenomena are, no further proof is, we think, required.

The second proposition affirms that that efficient cause is of its own nature evil, and its end is to do mischief to men, and especially to destroy the Christian religion.

In the third proposition and the proof subjoined, are described the various ways in which the devil acts on tables and other instruments. We regret that we cannot follow these two propositions into their details of illustration and proof—which in substance closely resemble those by which the propositions on the magnetic phenomena are elucidated and sustained—and that we must refer to our learned author for much other information deeply interesting and important.\* But we must make room for two observations, and with them we close our humble and imperfect task.

It is very remarkable that in the immense majority of cases the devil, when personating the souls of departed friends and others, and answering to questions put regarding their state or the state of the future world in general, denies the existence of hell or the acerbity or eternity of its torments. Nay, in many if not most cases the souls of the dead are represented as earnestly longing for the day when the stroke of death will reunite the living with them in all the bonds of old endearment in a land of unclouded happiness. Now we believe that Universalism, naked or modified, never at any former period numbered so many adherents among persons calling themselves Christians, as at the present day. Its stronghold is in

---

*Somnambulismi et claræ intuitionis, uti vocant, præstigiis mulierculæ illæ gesticulationibus non semper verecundis abreptæ, se invisibilia quæque conspiciere effutiunt, ac de ipsa religione sermones instituere, animas mortuorum evocare, responsa accipere, ignota ac longinqua detegere, aliaque id genus superstitiosa exercere ausu temerario præsumunt, magnum quæstum sibi, ac dominis suis divinando certo consecuturæ. In hisce omnibus, quacumque demum utantur arte vel illusionem cum ordinentur media physica ad effectus non naturales, reperitur deceptio omnino illicita et hæreticalis, et scandalum contra honestatem morum (n. 625).*

\* See also the essay in our fourth number above referred to.

America, the birthplace of Spiritism. This most fatal heresy—specially fatal, as lulling the conscience in a false repose—is that which is most commonly inculcated by the responses of both Magnetism and Spiritism, among those who hold universalism, or lean more or less to it; whilst before Catholics, or those Protestants who on this point hold the Catholic doctrine, the spirit communications, when touching on the subject, are of the very opposite import. What the devil wants, in the first place, is to get into communication with us; anything at all will do for a commencement: he knows how to improve the smallest opportunity: give him an inch, and he will gain ten ells. He greatly prefers to introduce himself with a lie, especially a heretical lie; but, if he sees that this is not feasible, he puts on truth and even breathes the very language of ardent and impassioned devotion. So all absorbing is his thirst for our ruin, he will, to ensnare us, become that which most he hates; he will become an angel of light, the Virgin Mary, the Saviour himself. He knows that the poison of his breath, though coming laden with the odours of sanctity, will in its own time do its deadly work. We need not go to the phenomena of Spiritism for examples of this; we have abundance of them in the most authentic lives of saints, in the Bible itself.\*

The other remark is in reference to an objection made against our doctrine, namely, that we are trying to revive the superstitions of the middle ages about magic and witchcraft, which the world has long since exploded, and literally laughed out. To which F. Perrone justly replies that we have not revived any superstition; but it is this very world itself, this very nineteenth century, which has revived magic, and therefore revived the old superstition, not *about*, but *of* magic—for magic is one of the species of superstition. Magnetism and Spiritism *are* magic and divination in one, and in the middle ages would have been so called. We need not stick so at names, when the things are in very essence and substance the same. This mighty world of the nineteenth century is, in its own way, about as bad as the worst of the fourteen that have preceded it, since Christianity was first enthroned on the imperial chair: and it is decidedly and beyond comparison the most pharisaical of them all. It lifts up its round, gigantic frame, girded about with endless coils of iron rail, and crowned with a tiara of great exhibitions, and stands erect before the Almighty, and stretches out its jewelled hands and lifts up its voice and cries aloud, “I am the very best of all the worlds

---

\* N. 437, note; 588–590, 715.

that have been before me, and I have done more wondrous works than they.” “Works for *myself*,” it should have said : as to works for God and for eternity, it has done nothing, but has undone everywhere and to an extent incalculable. In its own eyes it is rich and wealthy, and needeth nothing, but before Heaven it is poor and blind and naked. It is going fast to the devil; and but for the silent influence of that Church, which it hates and slanders and persecutes, would ere this have gone clean to him. It is not likely to improve, and most certainly never will improve, until it falls down upon its knees and strikes its breast, and from its heart sighs out, “O God, be merciful to me a world of universal sin.” It boasts of having laughed out superstition : but we know what it *has* laughed out, and scourged out, and trodden out; and we know that, as there is a sorrow that shall be turned into joy, so there is a laughter that shall be changed into tears.

---

## ART. II.—DR. PUSEY ON THE SYLLABUS.

*Appendix to the Eirenicon.* By E. B. PUSEY, D.D. London : Parker.

OUR two preceding articles on Dr. Pusey, which appeared respectively in the January and July of this year, have issued (we consider) in the following conclusions.

1. No doctrine which has ever been imagined on the Church's constitution—not even by the extremest Protestant or Rationalist—is more contradictory to the whole tenour of Scripture and Antiquity, than is the Anglican theory in every one of the shapes which Dr. Pusey has devised. There is no fact whatever in ecclesiastical history—either on the surface or beneath the surface—which has the remotest tendency to support that theory. Those facts which present difficulty in the way of Roman Catholicism, tell (so far as they go) not in favour of Anglicanism at all, but of infidelity.

2. If you look back at the history, whether of the Apostles or of the Church which succeeded them, all those facts which stand prominently recorded on its surface, which constitute (as it were) its tissue and its general drift, point decisively to the Roman Catholic theory, and are inconsistent with every other whatever.

3. But there is a certain number of individual and isolated facts, which present a certain superficial difficulty to Roman Catholics. There is no fact indeed adduced against them *by*

*Dr. Pusey*, which cannot by a very little attention be exhibited in perfect harmony with Roman Catholic doctrine. Yet we will not deny that there are facts to be found, though *Dr. Pusey* has not succeeded in finding them, which (whether from having been imperfectly recorded, or from whatever cause) constitute a real objection so far as they go. Considering, however, the enormous mass of historical events which have come into contact with Roman Catholicism during an existence of eighteen centuries, and considering the extraordinary peremptoriness of the Church's claims, it is most marvellous that the apparent objections are not far more numerous. All historical conclusions, however certain, are encountered by this or that plausible difficulty; and certainly there is no historical conclusion of equal magnitude, to which the unsolved objections are nearly so trivial and insignificant.

As regards those particular objections which have occurred to *Dr. Pusey's* mind, there is not one (as we just now observed) which cannot be encountered easily and with complete success. Yet we will not here enter on their consideration, even in that limited degree which we had proposed. In our last number we pointed out (p.32) that we could not consider them all, unless we were to protract our controversy with him over a period of some ten or twelve years. We added that they are divisible into two different classes. On the first class, we said, it is very easy to lay down certain general principles, which apply in common to all, and which may readily be adapted to each individual case: and we proceeded (p. 33) to draw out those principles. But as to the second class, we showed that from their very nature no other reply is abstractedly possible, except a consideration of them one by one. Accordingly we proposed to treat in our present number, explicitly though briefly, what may be called *Dr. Pusey's* chief representative instances of either class. As appertaining to the former, we were to deal with SS. Cyprian and Augustine; as appertaining to the latter, with S. Liberius and Honorius.

Our article was in the printer's hands before the end of April, and consequently before we had the slightest expectation of F. Ryder's pamphlet; and it is plain that the appearance of that little volume must importantly affect our plans. As to the four last-named anti-Roman difficulties, they have been again and again both urged and refuted in controversy: there is no greater reason for treating them now, than for treating them at any other time; and no reason why they should be taken in hand by ourselves, rather than by any other Catholic controversialist. Moreover, there is every hope that before very long F. Harper will examine them, far more profoundly



than we should have had the leisure to attempt, or indeed than the present writer possesses the learning to effect. On the other hand, F. Ryder's various arguments have a peremptory claim for consideration on ourselves in particular; and moreover will not conveniently admit of delay. We must terminate therefore our earlier controversy, in order to enter on our later.

There is one portion however of Dr. Pusey's argument, which does possess a peremptory claim on our own attention, as having been specially addressed to ourselves. But it happens most opportunely, that in addressing ourselves to this argument, we shall be at the same time making important way in the newer controversy also. Its consideration then shall be the theme of our present article. We allude, of course, to his comment on the Syllabus of December 8, 1864.

More than one Catholic writer has misunderstood him on this head. It has been fancied that his assault was directed, not against the highest, but against the humblest of Catholics; not against Pius IX., but against a writer in the DUBLIN REVIEW. It is quite impossible however for any one so to interpret Dr. Pusey, who reads his comment with the slightest care. For instance—

The writer in the DUBLIN REVIEW *has shown* that the Encyclical of 1864 does claim this [infallibility] in the name of Pius IX. (p. 289).

The main principle which Pius IX. *appears to have assumed*, that he is infallible [&c.] (p. 288).

The doctrine of infallibility laid down by Bellarmine is declared *in the Encyclical of last year* to be inadequate (p. 303).

This theory [on Papal infallibility] is contained *in the Encyclical of 1864* (p. 318).

On the principle *involved in the Encyclical of 1864 and the Syllabus*, that historical statements, made by the Pope, are infallible (p. 331).

Again: he says in one place (p. 294, note) that "the DUBLIN REVIEW *argues rightly*" on the meaning of one condemned proposition; and in another place (p. 302, note) that we have *understated* the Holy Father's doctrine on his civil sovereignty. And, he adds finally (p. 305) that "this extension of Papal infallibility" must "embarrass the defence of the system." Of course, no imaginable theory of *this Review* could embarrass the defence of Catholicism; because any defender of Catholicism might throw our private theories to the winds: that which embarrasses the defence of Roman Catholicism, must be something recognized by the standard authorities of that religion. But we have almost said too much on a matter which really does not admit of a second opinion. Dr. Pusey

treats the DUBLIN REVIEW throughout, not at all as the object of his attack, but as having brought prominently before the public eye those particular features of modern Roman teaching, which he desires to criticize.

Towards the beginning of his comment (p. 290) he drags in the old question of Gallicanism; though what in the world that controversy can have to say on the *object-matter* of infallibility, it is difficult to guess. We are very confident it would have been fully as axiomatic to Bossuet as to Bellarmine, that the Syllabus, so soon as accepted by the Episcopate, became an infallible Rule of Faith: and, at all events, Dr. Pusey has not said one syllable to prove the contrary. It so accidentally happens, indeed, that Gallican doctors—*e. g.*, Regnier and Montagne—have spoken more emphatically and explicitly on the extent of the Church's infallibility, than have Ultramontanes themselves.

Our author's main propositions are these two: (1) "Pius IX. has extended the limits of infallibility far beyond those laid down by Bellarmine;" and (2) "the latter claim is even more obviously refuted by history than the earlier." Our first business then must be to consider, what is the amount of infallibility which has been claimed by Pius IX.

And here at first reading Dr. Pusey's characteristic mistiness becomes apparent. In p. 292 he lays it down, as Pius IX.'s judgment, that various Pontifical statements are infallible, which are neither "connected with the substance of Revelation," nor "in any way formal in their character." You would suppose him to mean, that Pius IX. claims infallibility for the Pope's casual remarks on the prospect of rain or the probable heat of the summer. Yet only four pages earlier (p. 288) he had limited the Pope's claim to the case of "*formal utterances*" on "*matters connected with the well-being of the Church.*" And though even this limitation, as we shall presently show, is insufficient, yet surely it renders inexcusable the mis-statement contained in his later passage. We will not however dwell further on these incidental flaws, but occupy ourselves with the substance of his argument. And on the extent of infallibility claimed by the Pope, we are glad to find ourselves agreeing with Dr. Pusey's two main propositions; though, no doubt, we differ importantly on one or two consequences which he would thence deduce.

His first main proposition is, that Pius IX. claims infallibility for the Encyclical and Syllabus. We have so often in these pages expressed our reasons for assenting to this proposition, that here we need say no more on the subject.

So far then we are in perfect accordance with our author.

But he seeks to infer from this proposition that, on the Ultramontane theory, there can be "statements of infallible truth" which are in no way "connected with the substance of Revelation" (p. 292); and here we can only express our amazement at his reasoning. It is founded on the following very important words, put forth by Pius IX. in the "*Quantâ curâ*" :—

Nor can we pass over in silence the audacity of those who, not enduring sound doctrine, contend that without sin and without any sacrifice of the Catholic profession, assent and obedience may be refused to those judgments and decrees of the Holy See, whose object is declared to concern the Church's general good, and her rights and discipline, so only it do not touch the dogmata of faith and morals. But no one can be found not clearly and distinctly to see and understand, how grievously this is opposed to the Catholic dogma of the full power given from God by Christ Himself to the Roman Pontiff, of feeding, ruling, and guiding the Universal Church.

From this passage, as Dr. Pusey mentions, we derived an argument in April, 1865 (pp. 445-7). Pius IX., we pointed out, teaches that the Pope is in the habit of putting forth certain infallible judgments, requiring assent under pain of sin, which do not directly "touch the dogmata of faith and morals," but "whose object is declared" by him "to regard the Church's rights, discipline, and general good." His declarations on his civil principedom, we added, may be given as instances in point. But to whom, except to Dr. Pusey, would it have ever occurred to say, that a judgment, which concerns "the Church's rights, discipline, and general good," can possibly be otherwise than "connected with the substance of Revelation"? How does the Pope know anything *about* the Church and her rights, except through "the substance of Revelation"? Dr. Pusey writes as though the Church's interests and prerogatives had no more connection with the Deposit of Faith, than they have with some theory of mechanics or hydrostatics. But it is of course simply impossible—it would be a direct contradiction in terms—that the Pope should speak of "judgments" which "regard the Church's rights, discipline, and general good," but which do not at the same time indirectly "touch the dogmata of faith and morals." See DUBLIN REVIEW, *ib.*, p. 447.

It will reasonably be asked therefore, in what precise sense those words of the "*Quantâ curâ*,"—"dummodo fidei morumque dogmata non attingat,"—can most appropriately be explained. Their most probable interpretation seems to us, that they are not given as the words of Pius IX., but of

those whom he is condemning. By “dogmata of faith and morals” are understood those verities which the Apostles actually taught to the Church. Certain unsound thinkers consider that the Church’s infallibility is limited to the office of testifying these verities, or at least of also thence drawing strictly logical and immediate deductions. As regards any proposition external to this sphere, they would say that “it does not touch the dogmata of faith and morals;” and that the Holy Father therefore is not infallible in pronouncing it. This is the exact error here condemned.

We may illustrate this interpretation of Pius IX.’s language, by an earlier decree; to which attention has been drawn by F. Knox in his invaluable pamphlet on infallibility. Quesnel’s 94th proposition runs thus:—

Nothing produces a worse opinion concerning the Church in the minds of her enemies, than to see despotism there exercised over the faith of believers and divisions fostered, for the sake of things *which neither injure faith nor morals*.

Quesnel’s allusion is to the Church’s decisions on the *dogmatical fact* of Jansenius’s meaning. Now no one will understand Clement XI. as admitting, that a denial of this fact did *not* really “injure faith nor morals;” or that by imposing belief in this fact, the Church really exercised undue despotism over the faith of believers. He merely quotes Quesnel’s language as it stands; and condemns it according to the obvious meaning and implication which it bears in *his* mouth.

Before concluding our comment on this very important extract from the “*Quantâ curâ*,” it may be worth while to give reason for agreeing with Dr. Pusey (p. 304) that the word “sin,” as there found, expresses “mortal sin.” Two different offences are mentioned in the extract:—(1) the not *assenting* to certain Papal *judgments*, and (2) the not *obeying* certain Papal *commands*. The word “sin” is applied univocally to both these offences: but no one will doubt that the latter offence is mortal sin; so therefore also is the former.

So far then our position stands thus. We agree with Dr. Pusey’s first main proposition; viz., that Pius IX. claims infallibility for the Encyclical and Syllabus: but we dissent from one inference which he would thence derive; viz., that Pius IX. claims infallibility for certain “statements unconnected with the substance of Revelation.” We next proceed to his second main proposition; and with *it* also we concur. We concur with him in thinking, that the claim to infallibility put forth in behalf of the Syllabus, taken in connection with

other concomitant circumstances, implies the claim of *ex cathedrâ* authority in behalf of those various Pontifical Acts, from which the Syllabus is compiled. But although Dr. Pusey and ourselves are here in perfect harmony—we find there are one or two Catholics, who differ both from him and us; who agree indeed in substance with our doctrine on infallibility, but who do not admit the truth of this particular proposition. We will therefore exhibit the relevant argument, in greater detail than we have previously done.

We are here then, for the moment, arguing in company with Dr. Pusey against those Catholics, who admit indeed that the Syllabus is infallible, but who do *not* admit, as a consequence, that all the Pontifical Acts were issued *ex cathedrâ* from which the Syllabus was compiled. And we grant of course most readily, that *in itself* no such consequence need follow. Nothing is more easily imaginable, than that certain utterances, which were originally put forth in a less authoritative shape, should at a later period be sent round to the bishops as infallibly true. Our argument only reaches to this, that such a supposition is at variance with the actual circumstances of the case. In the first place then, observe the wording of Cardinal Antonelli's letter:—

Our Holy Father, Pius IX., Sovereign Pontiff, being profoundly anxious for the salvation of souls and for sound doctrine, has never ceased from the commencement of his Pontificate to proscribe and condemn the chief errors and false doctrines of our most unhappy age, by his published Encyclicals, and Consistorial Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters. But *as it may happen that all the Pontifical Acts do not reach each one of the ordinaries*, the same Sovereign Pontiff has willed that a Syllabus of the same errors should be compiled, to be sent to all the bishops of the Catholic world, in order that these bishops may *have before their eyes* all the errors and pernicious doctrines which *he has reprobated and condemned*.

He has consequently charged me to take care that this Syllabus, having been printed, should be sent to your [Eminence] on this occasion and at this time, when the same Sovereign Pontiff, from his great solicitude for the salvation and [general] good of the Catholic Church and of the whole flock divinely entrusted to him, has thought well to write another Encyclical Letter to all the Catholic bishops. Accordingly performing, as is my duty, with all suitable zeal and submission the commands of the said Pontiff, I send your [Eminence] the said Syllabus together with this letter.

I seize with much pleasure this occasion of expressing my sentiments of respect and devotion to your [Eminence], and of once more subscribing myself, while I humbly kiss your hands,

Your [Eminence's] most humble and devoted servant,

G. CARD. ANTONELLI.

Rome, Dec. 8, 1864.

Now we would entreat our friendly opponents to consider, whether the wording of this letter is consistent with their hypothesis. You are to choose between two alternative suppositions. Did the Pope issue the Syllabus for the purpose of pronouncing, on some of the denounced errors, a more authoritative and irreformable condemnation than they had hitherto received? Or did he issue it merely in order that the condemnation, which had *already* been pronounced, might become more generally known and more distinctly understood? The Cardinal's words seem to us really as plain as any words can possibly be, in favour of the latter alternative.

Then further. The first sentence of Card. Antonelli's letter is taken word for word from the "*Quantâ curâ*." When therefore in that Encyclical Pius IX. declares that, from the very commencement of his Pontificate, "in many published Encyclical Letters and Consistorial Allocutions and other Apostolic Letters," he had "condemned the chief errors of this our most unhappy age,"—there can be no possible doubt that the various Acts to which he refers are those very pronouncements from which the Syllabus is compiled. But what does he say of these Acts in the "*Quantâ curâ*"? He parallels them in character to those "most wise Letters and Constitutions," whereby his various predecessors "unveiled and condemned *heresies* and errors . . . adverse to our Divine Faith, to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, to purity of morals, and to the eternal salvation of men." But no one, of course, will doubt that such Letters and Constitutions were delivered *ex cathedrâ*: neither therefore surely can it be doubted with any reason, that those Pontifical Acts were delivered *ex cathedrâ* to which the Syllabus refers.

So far therefore we are entirely in accordance with Dr. Pusey. Nor again can we think his inference at all unreasonable, that any other Pontifical pronouncement, which possesses the same characteristics with those Acts to which the Syllabus refers, is invested also with the same *ex cathedrâ* authority.

Now all *ex cathedrâ* utterances are issued, for the direct purpose of conveying doctrinal instruction to the Catholic Church; and all the doctrinal instruction therefore which they contain is infallibly true. But, as we have so often argued, preambles, arguments, *obiter dicta*, are not doctrinal instruction; and there is no reason therefore whatever, for ascribing infallibility to the preambles, arguments, and *obiter dicta*, which may be found even in Pontifical Acts issued *ex cathedrâ*.\*

---

\* Of course these preambles, arguments, and *obiter dicta* are often of great



But here Dr. Pusey interposes (p. 302); and he argues from the Syllabus that, according to Ultramontane principles, “*every sentence in every pronouncement of the Pope is to be held as infallible.*” For this singular inference he adduces only one argument; and that one so trivial, that there is some difficulty in supposing him serious. “Prop. lxi.,” he says, “‘the injustice of a fact, being prospered, brings with it no detriment of the sancity of the right,’ is only an *incidental statement* of the ‘*Jamdudum cernimus.*’ . . . Incidental statements then are, equally with the most formal propositions, matters of faith.” By “matters of faith” Dr. Pusey means, we presume, not dogmata defined as *of faith*, but Catholic *truths*, infallibly declared to be such; and we fully hold that the contradictory of prop. lxi. has been infallibly pronounced to be a Catholic truth. The actual *words* also, we admit, occur but incidentally in the “*Jamdudum cernimus.*” But as to the *sense* of those words, it is imbedded (as a moment’s examination will show) in the whole substance, not only of that particular Allocution, but of many other Pontifical utterances also. And this is actually Dr. Pusey’s whole ground for the following monstrous allegation:—“The infallibility claimed,” he says, “*is equal in extent to that of the Divine Scriptures; so that each sentence, however incidental, becomes, like the Word of God, a sacred text*” (p. 303).

There is another totally mistaken inference, which Dr. Pusey derives from his second main proposition. He thinks (p. 292) that, in consistency with Pius IX.’s teaching, “statements, in order to their infallibility, need not be addressed to the whole Episcopate, or be *in any way formal in their character.*” He thinks, we suppose, that Pius IX. ascribes infallibility to the Pope’s private letters, or even to his remarks in conversation. But we deny altogether that infallibility is claimed for any utterances whatever, except for those put forth by the Pope in his character of Universal Teacher; *i.e.* (to use a common expression) pronounced *ex cathedrâ*. In order to show this nothing more is necessary, than to recount the various ways in which a Pope may signify his intention of speaking *ex cathedrâ*. We put aside, as external to our present question, the doctrinal declarations put forth in dogmatic Bulls or Briefs; because we are here considering only such pronouncements, less solemn in form, as those which have furnished materials to the Syllabus.

---

service, as determining more precisely the exact *sense* of the Pontifical instruction.

1. If an Encyclical Letter, addressed by the Pope to all Catholic bishops, contain any doctrinal instruction, that instruction must be infallibly true. This, we consider, should be regarded as a Catholic axiom; and the only question that can possibly be raised is, whether Encyclicals ever *do* convey doctrinal instruction. See on this head the second note to p. 156 of our last number.

2. Whatever doctrinal instruction the Pope expresses, in some form *different* from the Encyclical, must (of course) be considered as issued *ex cathedrâ*, just so far as there is reason for knowing that it is intended for the Universal Church. Three different characteristics have been mentioned by different writers, either of which would suffice to show that a particular document is thus universally intended. The characteristic on which we ourselves have always laid the greatest stress is, that the document shall have been *published by the Pope's command*. Dr. Murray adds that if, in any utterance officially put forth, the Pope pronounces on a tenet some *theological censure*, by that very fact, and from the nature of the case, he is addressing the Universal Church. See October, 1866, p. 522. Lastly, F. Schrader lays down that wherever such words occurred in a Pontifical Act, as "*motu proprio*," "*ex certâ scientiâ*," "*ex plenitudine potestatis*," or the like, there the utterance is undoubtedly *ex cathedrâ*. See April, 1867, p. 499.

For ourselves, we have always been disposed to lay the greatest stress on the first of these three characteristics. By the very fact of commanding the *publication* of some pronouncement, the Pope addresses it to the Universal Church; for what else can the command of publication mean? And in the "*Quanta curâ*" Pius IX. especially draws attention to this characteristic. "In many *published* Encyclical Letters and Consistorial Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters," he says, "we condemned the chief errors of this our most unhappy age." Indeed there is a sentence in the Allocution, "*Ubi primùm*" (*Récueil*, p. 208), which almost says in so many words that the command of publication invests any Pontifical utterance with the Encyclical character. "Since we have resolved," says Pius IX., "to *publish* this our Allocution, on this occasion we address our discourse to our other Venerable Brethren also, *the Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops of the whole Catholic world*." By the very fact of publication then he addresses the Universal Episcopate.

Such is the view we would maintain, on the authority of those minor Pontifical Acts which are here in question. Doctrinal Encyclicals, formally addressed to the whole Episcopate, are

primarily and most obviously *ex cathedrâ*: but those others also must be considered *ex cathedrâ*, which, in any one of the three above-mentioned ways, are invested with an Encyclical character.\* Nor will Dr. Pusey find any instance, either of Pius IX. or of any previous Pontiff claiming infallibility for any utterance of lower authority than these; for any utterance which he has not put forth in his capacity of Universal Teacher.

Here, then, we will sum up our general position towards Dr. Pusey, in regard to the infallibility claimed by Pius IX. for his various declarations. We admit our author's first main proposition, that infallibility is claimed for the Encyclical and Syllabus; but we deny the inference which he would thence draw, that infallibility is claimed for statements unconnected with the Deposit. We admit again our author's second main proposition, that infallibility is claimed for those various Pontifical Acts from which the Syllabus is compiled; and we admit, also, his inference that, by parity of reasoning, infallibility is claimed for all other Pontifical Acts, which possess the same characteristics. But we totally deny his two other attempted deductions. We totally deny that infallibility is claimed for any Acts which were not put forth by the Pope in his capacity of Universal Teacher; and even as regards those Acts which *were* so put forth, we totally deny that infallibility is claimed for their preambles, their arguments, or their obiter dicta.

We are next to consider Dr. Pusey's second contention; viz., that the infallibility now claimed for the Church exceeds that claimed for her by Bellarmine (pp. 291-2). There is not a vestige of foundation for this statement, as we shall immediately show; but we cannot regard it as one of very serious moment. We never heard of Bellarmine's election to the Supreme Pontificate. If Pius IX. really claimed a

---

\* There is a small discrepancy between the statement in the text and one which is to be found in the Preface to Dr. Ward's volume on "Doctrinal Decisions." In that Preface (pp. ix, x) he speaks as though Allocutions, as such, were no less primarily and obviously *ex cathedrâ*, than Encyclicals addressed to the Universal Episcopate. One or two theological friends however, who cordially concur in his general doctrine, have given him reasons which convince him that the statement in the text is truer and more satisfactory. We may be allowed to remind our readers, that no theologian has hitherto methodically treated this particular question, on the infallibility of less solemn Pontifical Acts; and that much remains to be done before a complete theory can be exhibited. In his letter to F. Ryder, Dr. Ward "takes for granted" that he "may have made minor and incidental mistakes in treating so large a question" (p. 31).

larger infallibility than Bellarmine conceded, the only legitimate inference would be, that the latter did not apprehend Catholic doctrine in all its fulness; and of what uninspired theologian in the world can you confidently say that he did so apprehend it? We suppose e. g. that no writer, however eminent, who lived before the Jansenistic controversy, treated the Church's infallibility on dogmatical facts with at all the same clearness and preciseness, which are exhibited by very ordinary theologians who have written since that period. So an ante-Tridentine knew much less than a post-Tridentine, as to the full Catholic doctrine on Justification. Indeed, from every Pontifical judgment one or other Catholic truth receives fresh elucidation. And if Pius IX. *had* added importantly to a Catholic's knowledge on the extent of infallibility, no one but Dr. Pusey would see any difficulty in the supposition. The fact however is quite otherwise; and we may as well exhibit that fact.

In truth, Dr. Pusey's whole impression on the matter is mainly founded on two misapprehensions, which we have already corrected. For he regards Pius IX. as claiming infallibility for propositions (1) which he does not pronounce *ex cathedrâ*, and (2) which have no connection, direct or indirect, with the Deposit. Such a theory would doubtless have been regarded by Bellarmine with amazement; but then it would be regarded with no less amazement by the most Ultramontane theologian of the nineteenth century. However, it is worth our while to consider the matter in somewhat greater detail.

In the two passages quoted by Dr. Pusey (p. 291) Bellarmine expresses his doctrine on the extent of Papal infallibility. (1) "The Supreme Pontiff, when he teaches the whole Church, can in no case err in those things which appertain to faith;" *i. e.*, in those things which are directly or indirectly connected with the Deposit of faith and morals. That this is undoubtedly his meaning, will appear as we proceed; but it is also the more obvious sense of his words. (2) "The Supreme Pontiff not only cannot err in decrees of faith;—but neither can he err in precepts of morals, which are enjoined on the whole Church, and which have for their object [*versantur in*] things necessary to salvation, or things which of themselves are good or bad." In other words, the Pope, even apart from what he actually *teaches*, cannot issue any *command* to the Universal Church which is at variance with sound doctrine and morality.\*

---

\* Dr. Pusey totally misunderstands this second passage; but we need not dwell on the misconception for any purpose of our argument.

And so Ultramontanes have ever held. The Pope cannot err, they say, in the matter of faith and morals, nor in universal discipline.

We are next then to consider what are those teachings of the Syllabus, which Dr. Pusey considers external to the circle drawn by Bellarmine. And we may at once pass over such particulars as those mentioned in pp. 297-8 : viz., the Church's temporal power, whether direct or indirect ; the sinfulness of the principle of non-intervention ; the divinely-given immunity of clerics and of things clerical, in certain particulars, from secular law. On all these heads Dr. Pusey, not being a Catholic, may very naturally *differ* from the Syllabus : but he cannot deny that, if such doctrines of the Syllabus be truths at all, they are truths of Revelation or of essential morality ; and that they are therefore most indubitably within the sphere, which Bellarmine allows to Papal infallibility. There remain then after all but three particulars to be considered. Dr. Pusey complains (pp. 293-4) (1) that Pius IX. claims infallibility *on* matters of fact ; (2) that he claims to declare infallibly the necessity, under present circumstances, of his civil principedom (p. 300) ; and (3) that he claims to declare infallibly the expediency even in the present age, under certain circumstances, of prohibiting by law the practice of non-Catholic worship (p. 296). Let us take these particulars in order.

Firstly then, Dr. Pusey takes no pains whatever to explain what he precisely means by "a fact." In one sense the Trinity and the Incarnation are "facts." We must assume him however to mean by the term, "facts which of themselves are cognizable by experience." And we must add that it is perfectly monstrous to doubt, whether Bellarmine would or would not have included many such "facts," as within the limits of infallibility. Look, e. g., at the innumerable facts cognizable by experience, which are recorded in Scripture. Does Dr. Pusey doubt that Bellarmine would have ascribed to the Pope a power of infallibly condemning any tenet, which should contravene those facts ? Or suppose some misbeliever to assert, that no ante-Nicene Christian professed belief in the Son's Eternal Generation ; or that the Apostles permitted polygamy to their heathen converts ; or that the semi-Pelagians were condemned for considering Christ to have died for all men. Such allegations of fact would be entirely analogous to those recounted by Dr. Pusey in pp. 294-5 : yet we really believe he would himself ascribe to the Church a power of infallibly condemning them ; and at all events (which alone is to the purpose) he will not dream of doubting that *Bellarmino* ascribed to her such a power.

As to his two other objections, he will admit that Bellarmine accepted the infallibility of the Council of Florence; and also of those decrees of Constance which were confirmed by Martin V. We will quote, then, from those two Councils. Council of Constance:—"This present Council declares, determines, and defines . . . that, although in the Primitivo Church this sacrament was received by the faithful under both species, yet *in order to avoid certain dangers and scandals* this custom *was reasonably introduced* that it should be received under both species by those who consecrate, and by laymen only under the species of bread" (Denz. n. 585). Here the Council not merely defines the question of *dogma*, that Christ's Body and Blood are received under either species; but defines also that the discipline of communion under one species was "reasonably," *i. e. expediently*, introduced, in order to avoid scandals. Similarly the Council of Florence. The Greeks were required to believe, as a condition of communion, not only that the addition of "Filioque" to the Symbol was "lawfully," but also that it was "reasonably," *i. e. expediently*, made; for the sake of more fully "explaining the Truth, and under the then imminent necessity."

Now to apply these citations. Here are four propositions. "It was expedient, under circumstances, to communicate the laity under one species." "It was expedient, under circumstances, that 'Filioque' should be added to the Symbol." On the other hand. "It is expedient, under the present circumstances of certain countries, that non-Catholic worship should be there prohibited by law." "It is necessary, under present circumstances, that the Pope should retain his civil sovereignty." These two latter truths are, of course, *different* from the two former; but surely they are altogether similar in their general *character*. In either case the determination falls on a question of expediency, in reference to the interests of God and of the Church. Since therefore Bellarmine undoubtedly regarded the Church as infallible on the two former, there can be no doubt that he would have regarded her as equally infallible on the two latter.

It is abundantly plain then, from what has been said, that when Bellarmine spoke of the Pope being infallible "in those things which appertain to faith," he included under his words an indirect, no less than a direct, connection.\* For a certain doctrine concerning *expediency* is not *directly* connected with

---

\* In a later article we express more precisely the distinction between being "directly" and "indirectly" connected with the Deposit.



dogma; it cannot flow by strictly logical *consequence* from any portion of the Deposit. It is *connected* indeed with the Deposit, but not otherwise than *indirectly*.

The same inference as to the true meaning of Bellarmine's words follows from another consideration. The Council of Constance condemned various propositions of Wicklyffe and Hus as "temerarious," "scandalous," "offensive to pious ears;" and Martin V. emphatically confirmed the sentence. Bellarmine then undoubtedly held that these censures were infallibly just; and he extended therefore the Pope's infallibility to matters which are, but indirectly connected with the Deposit.

And here we may digress for a moment to a somewhat important question of terminology. It is a Catholic axiom that the Church is infallible "in materiâ fidei et morum;" i. e. in all matters bearing on the Faith and on morality. But it is sometimes supposed that this expression does not include doctrines, which are but indirectly connected with the Deposit.\* We cannot better correct this serious mistake than in the words of Montagne. "Martin V. declares the decrees against Wicklyffe's articles"—decrees, be it remembered, involving a multitude of minor censures—"as 'totidem determinationes conclusiones et decreta in materiâ fidei.' And the Council itself calls them 'determinationes in materiâ fidei'" (Cursus, vol. i. p. 1114). Yet these decrees (to mention no other particulars) refer to the true character of tithes; to the importance of universities and studies; to the genuineness of Papal decretals. See Wycliffe's propositions, 18, 29, and 38.

Lastly, Dr. Pusey maintains that the Papal infallibility claimed in the Syllabus is capable of refutation from history;

---

\* A correspondent of the *Tablet*, who signs himself "T.," considers the vow in behalf of Papal infallibility recently suggested in the *Civiltà* (see our last number, p. 208) as somewhat restricting the object-matter of infallibility. There cannot be a greater mistake. He quotes indeed in his favour another extract which we gave from the *Civiltà*; but he certainly misunderstands our own meaning, and we have no doubt at all that he misunderstands the writer from whom we quoted. Undoubtedly intellectual "duty and devotion towards the Holy Father extend much further" than to the mere acceptance of his infallible decisions. A thoroughly loyal Catholic will yield due intellectual deference to those authoritative Papal declarations which are not strictly *ex cathedrâ*, and to the various implicit manifestations of the Pope's judgment. Perrone, if any man, is a moderate theologian: yet Perrone says (*de locis*, n. 725, note) that Pontifical declarations, which are not *ex cathedrâ*, should be received nevertheless with "humble submission (*obsequio*) of mind."

because various undeniable errors are to be found in such Papal utterances as those in question. Now Dr. Pusey, be it remembered, considers that infallibility is claimed for every single statement which a Pope may ever have made, however informal its character. And this being distinctly his supposition, we hardly know of so wonderful a fact, as that eleven pages (pp. 305-316) constitute pretty well the whole number of objections, with which his reading has supplied him against so monstrous a theory. Certainly either Divine Providence has watched with most miraculous care over every word of every Pope, or else Dr. Pusey exhibits but scanty knowledge of history in adducing so small a number of Papal errors. On every ground we should prefer to accept the former alternative.

In fact, after what has been already said in this article, it is hardly necessary to go through these adverse instances; because so soon as the doctrine is made clear for which we have been contending, the irrelevance of almost the whole number becomes at once apparent. However we will proceed to take them in order.

But first we will draw attention to one opinion, which we expressed just two years ago. It is quite impossible indeed that anything in the Eirenicon can contain reference to this opinion; for the Eirenicon appeared, we think, on the very same day (October 1, 1865), certainly in the very same week, with that number of our Review. Neither on the other hand (for the same reason) can our remarks have been motivated by any wish to elude any of Dr. Pusey's objections. But we think that a statement of this opinion is absolutely requisite, for a comprehensive view of that question which Dr. Pusey has raised. We stated then (p. 422, "Doctrinal Decisions," p. 185) that there are various doctrinal instructions put forth by the Pope *as Pope*, and yet not precisely in his capacity of Universal Teacher. Such instructions are intended as inculcations of Catholic doctrine; yet they are addressed, not to the Universal Church, but to this or that individual or body of men. As to these instructions, no one of course claims for them *infallibility*, i. e. a Divine *promise* of inerrancy: yet we hold it as a piously probable opinion, that God will *in fact* preserve them from error. If Dr. Pusey were to show—he has not even approximated to showing—that any one of these instructions had been mistaken, he would deprive us of (what would thus be proved) an illusion, from which we should regret to part; but he would do nothing whatever to forward his own argument. What he is required to do, if he would advance any solid objection against Catholic doctrine, is to

show that the Pope has fallen into what Catholics will admit to be error, in some doctrinal instruction issued *ex cathedra*. And this we are absolutely certain that Dr. Pusey will never accomplish.

In entering then on an examination of his instances, we will again recite what are those doctrinal utterances which the Pope puts forth *ex cathedra*. Over and above those dogmatic Bulls or Briefs which are solemnly promulgated, and about which there can be no possible mistake,—there are these: Doctrinal Encyclicals addressed to the Universal Episcopate; Allocutions or Apostolic Letters, of which he himself commands the publication; Allocutions or Apostolic Letters, in sanction of which he appeals to his office as inheritor of S. Peter's faith. Not the preambles of these, nor their arguments, nor their obiter dicta, are infallible; but only the doctrinal instructions which they directly contain. Finally, in whatever shape the Pope expressly denounces a tenet as deserving some theological censure, such denunciation must be accounted *ex cathedrâ*. It is Dr. Pusey's business to show, if he can, that some one of these various *ex cathedrâ* instructions has contained what Catholics will admit to be doctrinal error. We will take in order the various cases alleged in the *Eirenicon*.

Firstly (p. 306) he cites a series of declarations put forth by different Pontiffs at different times on the prohibited degrees of marriage. We believe there is no real difficulty in bringing these various declarations into perfect harmony with each other; \* but there is not the faintest vestige of a ground for alleging that any one of these declarations was issued *ex cathedrâ*. They may well be counted indeed as belonging to the other class just mentioned; as being doctrinal dicta officially uttered by this or that Pope. But there is not the most distant pretext for affirming that any of them were intended for the instruction of the Universal Church.

Dr. Pusey next quotes (p. 307) Pope S. Celestine's letter to the bishops assembled at Ephesus. When first the *Eirenicon* appeared, we pointed out (January, 1866, p. 191) that, even as the passage stands in his pages, it contains nothing which can give the Roman Catholic a moment's difficulty. But we also drew attention to the fact that, by some most strange carelessness, he has (at the very turning point of the whole) substituted the word "equally" for the words "in common."

---

\* The present writer does not profess to have gone into the matter; but a friend, in whose theological accuracy we have the greatest confidence, expresses confidently the opinion given in the text.

Our author certainly is resolved to make the most of whatever he can get. For he proceeds to cite, as anti-Roman, S. Celestine's declaration that "the assembly of priests," *i. e.* of bishops, "is the visible display of the presence of the Holy Ghost"; and S. Leo's, that his own statement of doctrine had been "confirmed by the irreversible assent of the whole brotherhood" (pp. 307, 8). As to the former, it strikingly resembles much which fell from Pius IX. only the other day. As to the latter, it is a pity Dr. Pusey did not add the concluding sentence; "that in this also *the members* may be in harmony *with their head*."

We now come (p. 308) to a complimentary letter of S. Gregory the Great to Eulogius of Alexandria, on the close relationship of those three Sees, which in some sense were S. Peter's—Rome, Antioch, Alexandria. No one can pretend that this is an *ex cathedrâ* instruction: for it is a mere private letter of compliment and affection, accompanying some presents, and returning thanks for others received. But even if it *had* been such an instruction, we are quite unable to guess of what anti-Roman doctrine our author suspects it. On the intimate connection of these three Sees, look at some important and interesting remarks of F. Schrader "*de Unitate Romanâ*," vol. ii., p. 59, et seq.

As to the next passages from S. Gregory, they can no more be accounted *ex cathedrâ*, than Ben. XIV.'s work, "*de Synodo Diocesana*"; which he wrote when he was Pope. Their doctrine however is most unexceptionable. "That is said to the Christian Church," says S. Gregory in effect, "which was never said to the Jewish: 'whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,' &c."

We then arrive (pp. 309–314) at those declarations put forth by S. Gregory against the appellation of "Universal Bishop," to which we referred in our last number (pp. 14, 15). Catholic writers have abundantly explained these various declarations; but of not one in their number can any one even colourably allege that it was uttered *ex cathedrâ*. It may be added that controversialists have brought together various expressions of S. Gregory, to show how extremely far he was from disclaiming a divinely-given supremacy over the whole Church. As these do not really concern our argument, we will but remind our readers of the catalogue by reciting two. "If any fault is found in bishops, I know not what bishop is *not* subject to the Holy See." Again, when Natalis, bishop of Salona in Dalmatia, had set aside his sentence with regard to the Archdeacon Honoratus, S. Gregory thus writes: "if any one of *the four Patriarchs* had done this, such con-

tumacy could not have been passed over without the gravest scandal." \*

As to S. Leo IX. who follows, his letter again possesses no characteristic of an instruction *ex cathedrâ*. At the same time nothing can be more orthodox. In regard to the word "rank," Dr. Pusey must well know what is familiar to every tyro in ecclesiastical history; viz., that such words as "rank," "dignity," "honour," are constantly used by the Fathers, for what belongs to "order," as distinguished from jurisdiction.

Dr. Pusey next quotes S. Leo II.'s well-known confirmation of the sixth Ecumenical Council. He says that in that confirmation the Pope spoke of Honorius as "having attempted to subvert the spotless faith of the Apostolic Church." Now no one will expect us to enter episodically into the whole case of Honorius; and there is less reason for doing so, because a contributor to this REVIEW is preparing an article on the whole subject. Here therefore we will confine ourselves to four remarks, which will amply suffice in reply to our present opponent. (1) Dr. Pusey is surely reprehensible for not mentioning a fact, which of course he very well knew; viz., that S. Leo II.'s words run in the Greek quite differently: "permitted this unspotted Church to be defiled (*μιάνθηναι τὴν ἄσπιλον παρέχωρησέ*)." (2) The Greek, and not the Latin, is the original of S. Leo.† Now no one alleges that Monothelitism existed in the local Church of Rome; the words therefore can only mean that Honorius, by his culpable remissness, permitted Churches in communion with Rome, and so in some sense Rome herself, to become defiled with heresy. (3) A letter was written by the same S. Leo II. to the Spanish bishops,‡ in which he expressly says that Honorius was condemned, because "when the flame of heretical dogma began to burn, he did not extinguish it as became his Apostolic authority, but *by neglect* promoted it." (4) It is most improbable that S. Leo II. took a more unfavourable view of Honorius's doctrine than S. Agatho, the very Pope who convoked the Council against the Monothelites. Yet S. Agatho, in his letter to the Council, says expressly: "This Apostolic Church of Christ [the Roman] has never turned aside from the path of truth into any portion of error."

In fact the case of Honorius, if justly understood, is a conspicuous exhibition of true Catholic doctrine. On the one

\* Lib. ii. ep. 52; lib. ix. ep. 59.

† See, *e. g.*, Hefele, History of Councils, vol. iii., p. 370.

‡ Quoted by Palma, vol. i., p. 463.

hand many holy Popes have been canonized, as for other reasons, so also because of the unwearied assiduity with which they have guarded purity of faith. It is no derogation, then, from the Papal office, that a Pope shall be honoured by the Church after his death for his especial diligence in defending the Faith. Neither therefore is it a derogation from his office, that he shall be *anathematized* after his death for his signal *neglect* in the fulfilment of that duty. But secondly, Honorius was very far indeed from being the only orthodox bishop, who took no active measures against the spread of Monothelitism. Why, therefore, was he alone anathematized? What other reason for this circumstance can even be imagined, except the obvious one, that a duty is incumbent on the Bishop of Rome, differing altogether *in kind* from that appertaining to any other bishop, of watching over the Universal Church?

Dr. Pusey proceeds to cite S. Leo the Great and Pope Adrian (p. 315) as mutually contradictory on the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The former says that the order of patriarchal precedence was settled by the Nicene Canons; the latter that it had been decided by Papal authority. But since the Nicene Canons were *confirmed* by Papal authority, where is the discrepancy? S. Leo says indeed, that he *obeys* the Nicene Canons: but so also Pius IX. obeys the law of the Church; he abstains, e. g. on Friday, and would tell you that he does so in obedience to the existing law. Would he mean by this, as Dr. Pusey seems to suppose, that he has not the power (if to him should seem good) to dispense the Church from this law of abstinence? Dr. Pusey indeed, in his comment (p. 317), says, that S. Leo appealed to "the *immutable* decrees of Nice;" but this word "immutable" is his own most gratuitous introduction.

Lastly, our prejudiced opponent quotes (p. 315) passages on the Immaculate Conception, from sermons preached respectively by S. Leo, by Gelasius, by Innocent III. If these sermons had been published for the Church's instruction by order of those Pontiffs, there would have been much force in such quotations. But we never heard of any Catholic who maintained, that whenever the Holy Father ascends a pulpit his address to the hearers is infallible.

Then after an interval, Dr. Pusey (p. 328) returns to the charge, and brings an accusation of historical inaccuracy against various passages of the Bull "Ineffabilis." No one who has studied F. Harper's treatise on the Immaculate Conception, will find any difficulty in replying to these charges; but the whole matter is absolutely external to our present subject. What was the doctrinal instruction conveyed



by the Bull "Ineffabilis?" Of course the definition of faith with which it concludes. All the rest is, as F. Harper indeed calls it, a "preamble." We have throughout carefully and consistently excluded preambles from our claim of Papal infallibility; and there is no possible reason therefore for our entering on the very easy task, of defending this particular preamble against our opponent's assault.

Dr. Pusey complains (p. 290) that, "in Pontificates so full of activity as that of Pius IX.," there is, on Ultramontane principles, an "almost yearly" addition "to the faith of those in the Roman communion." "Union with the Roman See," he adds, "on the part, e. g., of the great Russian church would involve this, that every one should be ready to receive whatever all past Popes had authoritatively uttered, and whatever any future Pope, though unhappily a Borgia or a Julius II., might utter upon any subject whatsoever." We do wish our opponent would try for once to apprehend the doctrine of those, from whom he so fundamentally differs. If we firmly hold these various utterances to be *infallible*, how can we regard it otherwise than as a signal blessing that, in every year,—or (for that matter) in every month and in every week,—we should learn more distinctly than before the bearings of truth on this or that error? And what on earth have the names of Borgia and Julius got to do with the matter? Certainly we needed not Dr. Pusey to tell us, that it would be a most intolerable burden if we were required to accept as infallible what does not really possess that prerogative: the only question at issue is, whether these utterances do possess it.

In real truth, as we said in our last number (p. 5), Dr. Pusey is as wholly astray on the Church's teaching authority, as is Mr. Martineau or Mr. Spurgeon. His own way of deciding about the possibility of communion with the Roman Church, is this: he examines her various definitions of faith, and sees whether he can ingeniously screw them into accordance with his own interpretation of Scripture and Antiquity. Why, if he were able to do so with the greatest ease, he would not on such an account be one step the nearer to admissibility into her communion. Until he is prepared to believe with Divine faith that she exclusively is the one Catholic Church—that she exclusively is commissioned by God to teach infallibly—no priest could admit him as one of her members. But when he is prepared so to believe—when he is prepared humbly to bow his intellect before her infallible voice—when he is prepared to accept everything which she teaches, not because he finds it in Scripture or Antiquity, but *because she*

teaches it—then he will understand the Catholic's true position ; and he will then see that it is the very same thing in principle, whether he is only permitted to accept *ten* doctrines on the Church's word, or whether he is privileged on the same authority to accept *ten thousand*.

And here, for the reasons mentioned at starting, we terminate somewhat abruptly our long series of criticisms on the Eirenicon.

---

---

### ART. III.—THE LIFE OF S. ALOYSIUS GONZAGA.

*The Life of S. Aloysius Gonzaga.* Edited by E. H. THOMPSON. London : Burns & Oates.

THIS work, the first in a new series of Lives of the Saints, is as delightful as it is unpretending. Its great charm is that which it derives from the character of the Saint it records—a character which it illustrates with a skill shown frequently in wise and deep reflections, and everywhere in the felicity with which the most characteristic incidents of a career as beautiful as it was brief are selected and commemorated. It is not our purpose either to review the book as a whole, or to confine our remarks to it. In following out the thoughts it suggests, and illustrating them out of the materials thus presented to us, we shall probably best second the aims of its author, and profit by the lessons bequeathed to us by the Saint.

Sanctity is at once the simplest and the most “many-sided” of all things. The characters of the Apostles, even after Pentecost, remained distinct one from another—a proof in itself, as has been remarked, of the truthfulness which belongs to the chief source whence we derive our knowledge of them. From the corresponding distinctness in the character of different Saints, a similar inference may be drawn as to the authenticity of their “Lives.” The gifts of grace are diverse, and in the supernatural order as in the natural, we find the most distinctive types of characteristic excellence. Saint is, so to speak, supplemental to Saint ; and from the harmonized dissimilitude of its several members the Church becomes thoroughly equipped with all which it needs for ministration or example. It is true no less that among all Saints are to be found those great generic features which belong to the

Household of Sanctity; and that from any one of them the main characteristics of holiness may be illustrated. But where resemblance exists, diversity sometimes teaches us to appreciate it the more; and from a life like that of S. Aloysius we learn many lessons that relate to both.

The author of this biography well remarks: "Perfection is set before all as the object of their aim, but not the same perfection" (p. 371); and an analogous statement is made in the preface: "Every man has his especial call; and the grace that accompanies it corresponds to the idea of him in the Divine Mind, as elected from all eternity, to a certain conformity to the image of His Son—a purpose which the awful privilege of freewill enables the soul to ratify or to defeat" (p. viii). The Saints are those who completely ratify that purpose: the consequence is that those elements of character which, in the case of ordinary Christians remain a confused mass, in their case clear both into distinctness and brightness. They have the diamond's sharpness and definiteness of outline, as well as its splendour. If the worldling does not see that distinctness, it is in part because his dazzled eye does not note the lineaments for the radiance which invests them, and partly because he does not take that interest in the subject which alone appreciates individuality. A man without an interest in nature hardly discriminates between tree and tree, while the shepherd's dog knows every sheep in the flock by face. To the man of the world, the lives of the Saints are all alike. For the man "whose eyes are open" they include an infinite variety. In multitude of types and processes, the marvels of natural history are probably small compared with those which belong to the supernatural.

The man of the world sees distinctness in characters strongly marked by some defect of our fallen humanity—by some malformation which he identifies with individuality. Yet even he must see that to an eye which passes his own in discernment as much as his own passes that of an animal, individuality may be marked in a different way. It may be evidenced not through the ruling passion, but through the predominant virtue; not by some picturesque moral disproportion, but by some variety among types, all of which alike have perfection of proportion. The diversity among material forms, all of them imperfectly proportioned, is not greater than that which, in the vast range of ideal art, is reconciled with perfect proportion. The Saints of God are divine works of art: they are the living monuments of supernatural grace, wrought out, touch by touch, and line by line, by that Sanctifying Spirit who is "*Digitus Paternæ Dexteræ.*" The

“Lives” of the Saints constitute the gallery in which those monuments are stored, that that Divine Artist may be praised.

Indifference to these triumphs of grace (a deadness which too often proceeds from an exaggerated interest in things devoid of all moral significance), entails even a greater loss than might have been expected. It is not only of *their* examples that we are deprived:—but the Supreme Exemplar of perfection is thus also to a large degree hidden from us. The Saints of Christ are mirrors of Christ. In their manifold and derivative perfections, that perfection, one and infinite, which belongs but to the King of Saints is brought down to our poor intelligence, and revealed to us in parts. In the character of Christ all perfections are blended in that ineffable Sanctity which exists but in a human nature assumed by a Divine Person:—in the Saints those perfections remain the attributes of beings exclusively human, though their human nature has been grafted into the Divine Humanity of Christ. In Christ we have the white light of Sanctity:—in the Saints the coloured beam of this or that virtue, especially imparted to one in particular. In one it is charity, in another humility; in one it is devotion to the Will of God, in another the contemplation of His Being. In all it is Christ; and in proportion as the eye becomes purified by resting upon those manifold but inferior semblances of Christ, the knowledge of Him who unites all perfections becomes more defined, and sinks with a more vital beam into the devout soul. To imagine that the spiritual eye requires little training, or that the Spirit Who alone gives it “Discernment,” employs no subordinate instrumentalities for that end, would be a grave error. The mere human eye is trained by degrees; and the scientific eye is assisted by numberless instrumentalities which no rational student would discard. The Saints are lenses that accommodate to the eye the vision of a virtue higher than their own. But what we know of the Saints we know through a familiarity with the details of their lives. Each is a being in himself; and to make each what he is has required the whole world of God’s Providence, and the whole world of His Grace. In no two of them do the virtues that bear the same names in mortal tongue imply altogether the same thing. In one, faith specially implies courage; in another insight; in one love specially implies zeal, in another patience. The relations of these virtues one to another, their progression, their combinations, their modes of joint or separate working—in all these things there is at once an infinite variety, and an absolute order. Amid the manifold and the inex

cable there are traces of a mystic unity : and again and again throughout that spiritual universe which they constitute we come upon the same footprints of the one Creator. It is as among the Alps, where the Infinite seems to look forth from the finite with aspect at once elevating and overawing ;—where the mountain lines—diverging or converging—now shooting past each other, now bearing far away in long oblique angle, and pointing toward infinite distance—seem to reveal, or at least to announce, some dread mathesis that belongs to a vaster world than ours—a world, which to our narrow intelligence appears less a world than a chaos, yet where, amid the labyrinth of marble ravine and glacier-river, nature indicates a method which she will not wholly disclose. Without an initiatory knowledge of Christ we have no key to the character of His Saints ; but on the other hand without a detailed knowledge of them and their ways, our knowledge of their Lord is but stunted.

In this last particular Christian philosophy might have anticipated the lesson which Christian history records. If the saints are fragmentary images of that illimitable perfection expressed in the Divine Humanity, so “ the Word made Flesh ” is Himself to us a picture of Him Whom no eye can see. We know Him dimly in Attributes which amid their vastness seem to us opposed to each other, and which to our littleness present no definite image. The lines of that incommunicable Countenance change before us like lightning ; and voices which mortal ear may not harmonize—the inorganic sound of some infinite universe, infinitely remote—seem to lie beyond all such music as we can grasp and mete. In the Creator become a creature the formless submits to form. Man had always felt that justice was a Divine attribute, and that love was a Divine attribute ; but how to envizage the two in union he knew not. Their union is to our finite apprehension shadowed forth in Him Who denounced eternal woe against impenitent sin, and yet wept over one whom He was about to raise from the dead. In God there is an Infinite Wisdom and an Infinite Power, both of which might seem to suffer contradiction while sin and sorrow riot amid the world He has made. In the Saviour Who “ opened not His mouth,” and suffered because He willed to suffer, we have an image of this dread long-suffering of God. In Christ, Who knew all things, and yet “ grew in wisdom and in stature,” we have an image of the Unbeholden One, Who abides in endless rest, and yet is an Energy and an Act perpetually creating the creation. Between the mode in which Christ images the Father to us and that in which His Saints image Christ, there

are analogies. In Christ are made visible not only those attributes which belong to His Father, but others also which could not belong to Divinity except in hypostatic union with humanity:—so in the Saints who share, and as it were dilate, their Lord's glorified humanity, we find not only the traits of that humanity, but others also which He could not possess who did not share man's fall—penitence, for instance. Again, as without a belief in God it would be impossible for us to recognise His image in "God made man," so without a knowledge of Christ (our great example) it would be impossible to profit by the examples He gives us in His images, the Saints. Once more, as they who from pride and hardness of heart renounce Christ, thereby cut themselves off from the Father, to Whom He is the appointed "Way," and thus lose hold at once of a living Theism, and of that Christianity which for us is the only authentic and practical Theism, so those who willingly reject His Saints to a calamitous degree make dim the mirrors in which they ought to see that Incarnate God, in part distorting the idea of His character with heresiarchs, in part divesting it of reality with men of the world.

But to return to the book before us. The diversity of character observable in the Saints results, not merely from the diversity of supernatural gifts, but also from those differences in natural constitution which grace always respects while it directs and harmonizes them. That region of human life which perhaps most attracts the thoughtful eye is the horizon line where the natural and the supernatural meet, and where the colouring from above allows itself to be modified by the configuration of its earthly support. In biographies taken, like the one before us, from authentic records, we ever see the man in the Saint, and learn in part how the time, place, and circumstances of his outward life co-operated with that interior grace which shaped him to a definite type of perfection. Some of the traits special to S. Aloysius result from his having belonged to the still surviving feudalism of North Italy at the close of the 16th century. We must bear in mind that though he died young, he did not die immaturely. He was a Saint; and therefore all the processes which form character had in him been perfected, though with an extraordinary rapidity.

The foundations of his character seem to have been laid in the intensity which belonged to his realization of divine things, a gift conspicuous in him when he was yet but a child. How much of this was due to baptismal grace we shall never know—a grace apparently forgotten by those



who are surprised at sanctity in childhood, when they should rather be surprised that it does not make itself recognized more often. "His head lady-nurse, Camilla Maynardi, often told her mistress that when she took the little Prince Aluigi in her arms, she experienced a thrill of devotion" (p. 11). Much must also be attributed to the natural influence on a being of lofty and delicate dispositions of a mother whose earliest desire for him was that he should be a saint, and who had taught him to lisp the names of Jesus and Mary before those of Father and Mother. Other children learn of heavenly things from earthly. The children of saintly parents begin with the higher, and interpret the lower by them. The heavenly antitype is so brought home to their earliest intelligence, that the earthly type derives thence alone its significance. That lofty, *a priori* estimate of things which under the ordinary conditions of man is sometimes learned as a branch of the Platonic philosophy by one whose moral habits have already grown hard, and whose lower instincts have perhaps developed themselves according to the maxims of Epicurus, becomes under happier circumstances the living law of a being still plastic and fresh—of one in whom the passions have not yet been awakened, and in whom experience, far from checking the spiritual aspirations, is contented to walk humbly in their footsteps up the hills of truth. We marvel that some few Christian children should thus start clear, and hold their own. Had we lived when the Gospel first brought to men the tidings of a regenerate humanity, should we not rather have expected that such would have been the usual franchise of the Christian child? There are consequences of grace which may be called natural in the supernatural order. Ordinary persons realize earthly things intensely; and as a consequence, spiritual things remain unrealized by them, and, though acknowledged as truths, hang in visionary distance like a far cloud on the horizon of their thought. In both respects the converse held good with S. Aloysius. In his daily walks he observed hardly any of the objects which he passed. He took no hold of worldly things, nor they of him; and even when the love of them seemed to have been sown in his youthful heart it turned out that the seed had fallen "on stony places," and the springing plant died away of itself. A few years after the Turkish naval power had been broken at the great battle of Lepanto, the father of the Saint went in command of 3,000 Milanese to defend Tunis, which then belonged to Spain, against the Sultan Selim II. He took his little son with him; and the child was delighted with the military movements, and of course became the delight of the

rough soldiers. But strong as was the aptitude he showed for all manly exercises, their attraction seems to have faded away of itself, just as in other cases the religious impressions of early childhood so often fade away. In all things a law of compensation prevails. Had the future Saint been alike devoted to earthly glory and to the praise of God, it would have been much more wonderful than that he should have valued the latter exclusively.\*

It is the more remarkable that men should find it difficult to believe in the spiritual gifts which have belonged to Saints even in childhood, considering the animation with which they record the gifts of another sort often found in the world's favourites. Mozart had so fine an ear that when a child he could detect in every chance sound some latent musical note, and wept if his ear was hurt by the slightest discord. Is not this as wonderful, though not as admirable, as the spiritual sensibility of St. Aloysius of whom we read (p. 25) "the first time he presented himself at the tribunal of penance, he was so overcome with reverence, shame, and confusion, that he fainted at the good father's feet." Before Pascal had heard of Euclid he had proposed to himself, and solved, multitudes of mathematical problems, drawing diagrams on the wall and inventing names of his own for angles and curves. Why should one who believes in some child who can multiply nine figures by nine in his head, or play a game of chess without seeing the board, be staggered when told of a corresponding power of abstractedness in a youthful Aloysius who prayed for half a day without wanderings of thought? The Saints are in religion what men of extraordinary genius or energy are in the world. At seven years old St. Aloysius refused to use a cushion when kneeling:—why is this more wonderful than those severities by which the child of some heroic race has often prepared himself for his military career? Some of his austerities were such as to a child must have been needless as a protection against temptation. The smile with which a wise man reads of such fancied dangers has nothing in it either of the sceptical or the scornful.

What this world calls "genius" has its extravagances, its excesses, and its eccentricities, and is far from running at a regular pace in the harness of conventionalities. It too has much that is worthy rather of admiration than imitation, and much that without demanding either, is the natural result of

---

\* A most amusing account of the child-warrior's exploits in his brief campaign, one of which nearly cost him his life, is given in page 15.

extraordinary aspirations under peculiar conditions. Perfect regularity and proportion should be looked for only in a Saint perfected—that is a Saint in heaven. It is incompatible with our militant condition. Bacon remarks that when the child's limbs knit quickly, and include no disproportion, it is a sign that he will reach no considerable growth. The Saints are those who have had large spiritual growth in them. We should remember, too, that there is a lower, as well as a higher proportionateness, and that some persons attain it, not by making their nature wholly spiritual, but by eliminating all but what is animal in it. To unite Body and Soul—a regenerate with an earthly life—a mortal lot with an immortal destiny—this is man's condition, and it is certainly to blend very antagonistic forces. Taking all things into account, merely to be born is, it must be owned, to "get into a great scrape," and by no means leads to an easy peace. Much more difficult must it be, then, to make a good thing of our contradictory life, and leave little for the place of Purification. The "strangeness" the world complains of in the Saints is but what might have been complained of in human beings by the merry Wood-Gods and Satyrs that glanced at them from the forest nooks, and rejoiced that they had not themselves to sustain the heavy burthen of a personal and responsible being!

We should bear in mind also that much which to us seems unreasonable in a Saint may not only have been to him salutary, but a special inspiration guarding him against some special danger. He Who makes His ministers "flames of fire" commonly gives to His Saints a peculiar ardour of nature—an ardour which might have worked itself out either in the sphere of their intellectual or their material being, and which makes them Saints only on condition of its being limited, directed, and forced to develop itself chiefly in the spiritual being. Such are the gifts of Him Who gave to men the true Celestial Fire:—

"And He tamed fire which, like some beast of prey,  
Most terrible yet lovely, played beneath  
The frown of man."\*

Respectable people sometimes descant on the temptations of the Saints, and affirm that no such trials assail them. Perhaps the reason is that they are respectable people but not Saints, and that they are spared what they could not resist. Perhaps it is that the tempter deems pettier temptations more suited to their mediocrity—is contented with their self-content

---

\* "Prometheus Unbound."—*Shelley*.

—and does not wish to wake them out of their dream of security. Or, perhaps they fancy that they meet no temptations because they never resist those temptations, just as the flying leaf does not feel the gale that splinters the tree. It is certain that the Saints have been marked by a timidity, as the world would call it, as wonderful as their courage, and guard the outward senses far more than those who have, compared with them, no inward power of resistance. It is the timidity that springs from that profound humility on which alone can be built the virtue which attains a great elevation. The Saint has no belief whatever in his own strength; and that Divine Strength which lives within him is a gift which, as he knows, may more easily be subverted through a single movement of pride (and false security is pride) than through any other lapse whatever.

Excess in things lawful is to ordinary men often a greater temptation than they are exposed to from things unlawful:—by parity of reasoning we see how mere participation in things lawful, but things incongruous with a higher vocation, may be a snare to the future Saint. Aloysius was constantly renouncing even what was innocent in human ties: such renunciation might have been dangerous to others, but it gave to him that perfect detachment without which he could never have reached the marvellous gift of prayer through which he was able to fulfil his special vocation. This is well illustrated in some of the many thoughtful passages with which the Saint's life is recorded in the work before us. "Solicitude and desire—these are the great foes of all prayer; but much more of contemplation. It may be possible to repeat vocal prayers with a certain degree of attention where they are not entirely banished; but with prayer of a higher order they are simply incompatible" (p. 175). \* \* \* "Here was the secret of all. His life-long study had been to pray much, to pray well, to pray always; and so convinced was he that prayer is the great lever in spiritual things, that he used to say that it was well-nigh impossible for any but a man of prayer and recollection to acquire full dominion over himself."

This wonderful confidence in prayer, so invariable an attribute of the Saints, is the natural consequence of their realizing the supernatural world. Prayer is that which, moving Him Who is omnipotent, has a derived omnipotence of its own; while it is also the only earthly power that is not in part illusory. If, then, those who realize the supernatural world give themselves for half their time to prayer, like the members of Contemplative Orders, however the world may sneer at what it fancies to be exaggeration, they are but doing, "*mutatis mutandis*," what the wise worldling does in his way. He

shuns, as inconvenient or incongruous, much that, measured by the most purely worldly and materialistic standard, might fairly claim to be innocent though not laudable. He passes, perhaps, not half his time, but the whole of it, *in applying means to ends*, that is, in using those instrumentalities which are to the natural world what prayer is to the supernatural. The social and the material worlds have, he knows, their laws;—to move them he must put those laws in motion; and to do this he must conform himself to those laws. He subjects himself therefore loyally to Nature; and his reward is this, that he gains from Nature a genuine insight into her ways, and such control over the unruly elements as she can bestow on *her* ascetics or contemplatives. This is just what is done by the Saint in the supernatural sphere. Prayers, and all those ministrations, in heaven and on earth, which are connected with prayer—these constitute the Living Laws by which the spiritual world is swayed; and to these he trusts as the engineer trusts to those laws which, at his bidding, call the sea-mole from the mountain quarry, or fling the bridge across the roaring strait. The distance to which the modern intelligence is falling from faith is by nothing more marked than by the straighter limits within which its appreciation of prayer daily shrinks. It began by inveighing against those who prayed constantly, stigmatizing the highest spiritual Action as idleness. It now attaches hardly any other efficacy to prayer than that which results from a reaction of the mind on itself. A man who prays can, it thinks, warm himself by that exercise:—but he had better not include outward things in his prayer. A prayer really answered it does not believe in. It would deem it as superstitious to believe in the real efficiency of prayer, as three centuries ago men declared it to believe in that of the Sacraments. It can excuse much that it cannot accept, and can play with the graceful shadows of devotion when it would be offended by the repulsive hardness of the palpable. It revolts from S. Aloysius's belief in prayer, and thinks it is only scandalized by his miracles. It objects that prayer ought to be not so much a special act as a general state of mind; one of those many statements which are true at their affirmative side, but untrue at the negative. From the lives of the Saints we learn that the habit is most constant where the act is most intense. We read of S. Aloysius,—“during the ordinary occupations of the day his soul was visited by God with marvellous consolations, and these not passing touches or short elevations of spirit, but overflowing torrents of joy” (p. 178). His humblest duties were consecrated by being discharged in the spirit of

prayer, a grace which was rendered easier to him by a certain child-like habit of the imagination which appears to be common among Saints—the habit of seeing in every thing a symbol of higher things than itself. “When engaged in preparing for the repast he would say—‘let us go and lay the cloth for our Lord, or for the Madonna’” (p. 246).

The root of S. Aloysius’ sanctity is to be found in the depth of his humility. “I am a crooked piece of iron, and am come into religion to be made straight by the hammer of mortification and penance”—such was his estimate of himself. While studying at the Roman College, he hardly ventured to lift his eyes when conversing even with the lay-brothers and seculars in authority. A more beautiful picture of youthful modesty can hardly be imagined than that which we owe to the graphic touch of his latest biographer. The youthful Prince “would wander into the country through the Porta Comasina, always selecting Thursday for this stroll; and, after bidding his attendants remain behind, he might have been seen loitering on the way, now reading, now picking violets, as though to while away the time, like one who is watching and waiting for some expected meeting. By-and-by in the distance might be descried the black figures of the Fathers approaching. They were returning from Chisola, a villa which they possessed about a mile and a half from the town, and where every week they spent some hours of recreation on that day. Lewis would now stand close to their path: he had watched for the joy of that moment to salute them courteously and reverentially as they passed: he would then follow softly on their steps, leaving such discreet interval as should remove him from their company, but keeping his eyes intently fixed on their retreating forms, as if he beheld so many blessed angels defiling from the gates of Paradise.” (p. 107). If a S. Gertrude conversed with our Lord habitually in the elevations of vision and rapture, so to S. Aloysius the closest union with Him would seem to have been accorded in the lowliest acts of obedience. In this supernatural grace we may trace, perhaps, the workings of a natural law also. Those who know best how to rule, know best also how to obey: and Aloysius to whom princely sway was a birthright, seems, when he had renounced it, to have been drawn by a special instinct to the converse yet analogous duties which belong to obedience. “He would often beg permission to go about Rome in a tattered habit, with a bag on his shoulder, to solicit alms” (p. 163).

To the same class of virtues we should, doubtless, refer the Saint’s unappeasable love of mortifications, whether physical



or mental. The sensitiveness of his nature made him shrink when publicly reproved; and therefore "he earnestly and frequently begged to be reprehended before all. This pain, moreover, was entirely voluntary on his part;—owing to the complete mastery which he possessed over his imagination, he might with the utmost facility have distracted his mind from what was going on, so that, hearing, he would have been as one that did not hear; but this he would have considered as defrauding holy obedience of its claims, and himself of its merits; he compelled himself, therefore, to taste as well as drink the cup presented to him" (p. 166).

The tenderness and refinement which belonged to S. Aloysius, whether they resulted from an organization of unusually delicate fibre, or from the habits of a palace, assumed, like all his qualities, a spiritual character. The pain he felt at any allusion to the worldly greatness he had relinquished showed itself in the blush which displaced the habitual pallor of his face. If any one spoke with feeling of Divine mysteries his colour went and came, his breath became short, and his slight frame was shaken so vehemently by the palpitation of his heart that his superiors sometimes interdicted or limited his devotions. The boy was shy and shrinking as a girl: yet he selected the most afflicted in the hospital as the special objects of his care. He shrank back in humiliation when an aged ecclesiastic demanded his blessing: yet his lowliness never degenerated into weakness. The instrument was more perfect because the wood of which it was made had a delicate grain; but it yielded martial as well as solemn harmonies—although its "songs of war" were those that "sound like songs of love." He had the profoundest sense of filial duty: yet year after year he bore up with humble heroism against his father's opposition to his vocation. He saved at a crisis of danger the brother who had owed him a throne; yet on entering his novitiate, he left "the home and the friends of his youth without shedding a tear, and scarcely addressed three words to that brother during the last brief hours which possibly they were ever to spend together." Others are so drawn to self that, if they are but moderately true to the *natural* objects of human affections, the world counts such fidelity to them as a religious merit. To him the natural ties were so "full of light" that they became transparent, and revealed those heavenly relations of which earthly ties are the types. The aspirations of others had become his sympathies. His gravitation was upward; and, as the author of this biography expresses it, his soul tended to God "as the falling stone seeks the earth" (p. 179).

The most sensitive natures are sometimes driven by a noble necessity upon the most absolute self-mastery, and therefore on the most intense repose. It was thus with S. Aloysius. When asked whether he did not pine for the relatives he had left, he answered that "he never recollected them save when he recommended them to God," adding that "by God's grace he was so entirely master over his thoughts that he never reflected upon anything but what he desired" (p. 155). For him it was necessary either to reach this state or to abandon contemplation. The author well remarks, "Just as an image is broken into fragments when the breeze passes over the surface of the stream, so it is with the soul when any earthly solicitude or desire sweeps over it while it is striving to receive the image of God into its placid depths" (p. 176). It is true no less that, as water which a breath can ruffle yields us, in its stillness, a more vivid image of tranquillity than the solid earth beside it, so the serenity reached by a nature as sensitive as that of S. Aloysius affords to us the most perfect image of peace. To this stillness of being was doubtless owing, not only the Saint's power of contemplating God, but another gift, viz., the power of looking through his own being as if it were that of another. "His Confessor in later years, the great Bellarmine, has recorded his testimony to the extraordinary discrimination which our Saint possessed in discovering the secret springs and motives of his actions. It almost seemed as if he beheld with his corporal eyes the precise point at which a thought or desire had arrived in its progress towards consent, so illuminated by grace was his mental vision. When by a close scrutiny he had satisfied his mind, so as to enable him to make a true confession, *he gave himself no further anxiety*; for, like S. Teresa, he confessed that his garden naturally produced only briars and thorns. 'Forgive me, Lord,' he would say, 'and grant me grace not to do so again:' after which he was perfectly tranquil, and made his confession briefly, clearly, unembarrassed by a shade of scrupulosity" (p. 163).

The absence of agitation and scrupulosity is nothing wonderful, where it results from the absence of self-knowledge, and from a forgetfulness of the Divine Justice. It is where the spiritual being has reached a lofty stature that serenity is as wonderful as if the tall tree stood unshaken in the storm. Such a condition would be impossible, doubtless, but for the special aids afforded by Confession which alone render habitual self-knowledge compatible with the absence of morbidness. Where self-knowledge rejects in its pride the aids which God has provided for it, unhealthy feelings attach themselves to it

so closely that modern philosophy, advancing a step further on the downward way, recommends as a remedy what it calls self-forgetfulness, meaning thereby self-ignorance and indifference to the soul's health. But neither this life nor the next accepts the burning of the bill as the payment of the debt. No wonder that those among the separated communities who believe in Sanctity desire to restore that Sacrament through which self-knowledge becomes practicable and wholesome. Without confession, not many steps upward are often possible. There are those who believe that all effort beyond this is time lost. What they really know is that it would be lost to them.

Among the characteristics of the Saints is that mysterious influence which they diffuse around them unconsciously, like a spiritual magnetism. As soon as S. Aloysius had entered on his novitiate at Rome all around him began to be the better for it. There is something alike elevating and poetical in the picture of youthful piety thus drawn by his biographer :—

Few weeks had passed before a palpable change came over the Roman College. The flame of divine love seemed to dart from one bosom to another, and even the coldest felt its warmth and began to kindle like the rest ; so that Ceparì himself, the witness of what he describes, when in summer time he contemplated 200 students scattered through the garden in parties of three and four at the recreation hour, could feel well assured from his knowledge of all, that there was but one subject of discourse among them, as they sat or wandered at will, like so many angels communing together amongst the trees of Paradise (p. 208).

Nor was his influence confined to his equals ; it was felt no less by his superiors. In a discourse, delivered in 1608, Bellarmine spoke thus :—

When I gave the spiritual exercises of S. Ignatius to Aluigi, I discovered in him such abundance of divine light, that I must confess that, at my advanced age, I learned from this youth how to meditate (p. 305).

It is not strange that, as his biographer relates :—

When raised to the Cardinalate, the venerable prelate not only continued his yearly practice of repairing to the College Church of the company to venerate the tomb of Aloysius on his anniversary, but used to make a devout visit to the room whence he had taken his flight to Heaven, and there would shed tears of tenderness in memory of their last parting.

Gladly would we carry further our illustrations of S. Aloysius's character, but we shall perhaps more suitably

express our gratitude for the lesson he teaches us, if we turn from him to pursue those thoughts relative to heroic virtue which become quickened in our minds as we muse on his life. A polemical age loses much in this matter. Catholic controversialists have by necessity been thrown so much upon answers to petty cavils and captious negations relative to the veneration of the Saints that they have not always been able to insist as strongly as they might otherwise have done on the great positive principles and moral ideas involved in such veneration, and the practical loss incurred by communities which discard it. What the Catholic asserts is, of course, not merely that the practice is defensible, but that the neglect of it is indefensible:—not that it is no remnant of Pagan idolatry, but that it is the Christian's especial preservation against the practical revival of that idolatry, either in the form of nature-worship, or of hero-worship. He does not affirm only that to venerate God's Saints is not, as the petulance and precipitance of the Sects assumed, to separate ourselves from God:—he affirms that not to venerate them, is to separate ourselves grievously from the citizens of God's kingdom, both on earth and in heaven, and to cut off many channels of communication between the lower part of that kingdom and the King of Saints.

It is when we study the lives of the Saints that we regard this vast subject, as it were *from within*, and see how closely it bears on our Sanctification. Children learn to speak mainly through sympathy and imitation, and they exercise those instincts because they associate frankly with those who know how to speak. The earlier instincts both of honour and of conscience are developed under similar conditions, and are often therefore not formed, or most imperfectly formed, in the hearts of castaways brought up among the courts and alleys of great cities. Among these last, even when removed at a later time to regions of less temptation, the higher instincts sometimes will not grow, because, again and again, some rude shock used to break the finer tendrils of their roots just when they were beginning to knit themselves in the soil. Habitudes are not to be formed out of maxims; and long before the passions of the child have begun to prove a temptation to him his moral sense may become irrevocably stultified because he has lived among those who regard right and wrong indifferently. At a later period he may receive moral, as he receives intellectual instruction; but it is communicated to him after a barren fashion, as when we teach mathematics to a child in whom the scientific faculty is not yet developed, and who has to measure the diagram with a pair of compasses before he per-

ceives whether the sides and angles are equal. Now the same danger which all recognize as regards our moral training assails also our spiritual being; and our protection against it is of a corresponding sort. In spiritual matters those who belong to the Church Militant are but children; and like other children they are intended to learn from their elders and betters—that is to say, from the citizens of the Church Triumphant. The two portions of the one great city are not separated, except by the perverseness of man. A portion of it sits on the hills amid the purer airs and the brighter lights; and another portion of it—the dark and narrow *Ghetto* within which we live while on earth—occupies the lower region; but there exists a divinely-appointed order of ministrations between the two. The inhabitants of the lower region communicate with those in the higher, and, so communicating, the children borrow insensibly from the elders. It is through the instincts and habits developed in that heavenly yet familiar intercourse that they learn to lisp the living language of sanctity which those without learn as a dead tongue. The one authentic standard of Christian perfection is sustained before their eyes in steadfast elevation; and they believe in it, both as a thing divine and as a thing practicable. Others often have standards absolutely opposed to the Christian ideal: but for them that true ideal is ever the chief of realities, and lives on both in their heart and their hope. They approach it, though on earth they may not reach it; and keeping it ever before them, their very shortcomings deepen that humility on which all genuine Christian virtue is founded.

The blindness of the worldly mind on such subjects is “night immersed in night”—the darkness of the natural man, wrapped around by a second cloud of inherited prejudice. A traveller from meditative Germany, or practical England, or America, drives into an Italian or Spanish village, bright with flowers, and banners, and lights, and resounding with music. The processions wind along the heights—the fireworks blaze in the market-place, and round the cathedral the waves of men swell and surge. In the scene there is much that is sublime, and something that is quaint. Our enlightened traveller can see but the latter when he learns that all this popular enthusiasm is the celebration of the Patron Saint’s Festa. He can appreciate the greatness of some statesman whose speech he has lately heard, or some warrior whose anniversary feast he has attended. But the villagers whom he despises have retained a knowledge worth more than all that he knows. Their minds too are haunted by the idea of greatness; but they have never forgotten that primary truth without

which the imagination can but pour us forth the “*Vinum Demonum*”—the lesson that the truest *Greatness* is *Goodness*. Their Saint is their hero, because he was preeminently good; and he was preeminently good, not because he fought hard for the world’s esteem, but because he sought the lowest place. They are proud of their Saint; and in praising him they praise God, Whose praise alone he desired to set forth. He brought them the Faith, perhaps 1,500 years ago, and they still rejoice as if a siege had been raised, and their city delivered from destruction, an hour before! Time and its centuries have not made them forget their benefactor:—the world with its illusions has not taught them to prefer false glory to true. What discernment, what fidelity, what generosity, what an exalted and authentic standard of all that man should venerate and imitate! To what do the peasants owe these gifts? To the circumstance that they have remained on speaking terms with God’s Saints! The world, in ceasing to have sympathies with these, falls to a distance from them,—a distance that must ever increase. First, men cease to aspire after heroic sanctity: next they cease to believe in it:—at last the very idea of it departs from their mind, as some ideal of poetry or architecture gradually vanishes from the world. The imagination of society renounces its baptism, and becomes reconverted to Paganism.

There can here be no neutral position. The saintly ideal was that which expelled the Pagan ideal native to man’s heart—that ideal in which sensuousness and pride combine to dress out the beautiful. Nothing could have effected this miracle but a genuine Christianity, a Christianity which conquers an animalized humanity by a spiritualized humanity. Pentecost was a beam from that celestial light which ever lives beyond the “*flammantia moenia*” of mortal life; and as the sunshine puts out the fire, so this beam from afar extinguished the flame that played on the Pagan altar. In the Church, Pentecost is—not a mere historic fact passed and gone—but an ever-living light and life. Among the sects, and in the world, the Pagan imagination repossesses itself of its abandoned seat. This is proved by the fact that to the diseased modern intelligence the Saints wear the aspect of Demigods, and the veneration of them seems a new sort of mythology. It is strange! A Newton can see the analogy between diamond and a bit of black charcoal; but the savage is unable to see the difference between gold and any worthless thing that glitters. Equally incompetent seems the clownish intelligence to discriminate between Christian Saints and Pagan Gods. No wonder that others should advance a step further, and



reject Christ, on account of some fancied resemblance to Budha. And yet the Christian and the Pagan ideals are not only unlike, but are opposites, and that whether we regard Christ or His Saints. It may have been perhaps in part for this reason that it was not till the latest remembrances and desires of Paganism had been "with sighing sent" from their old homes, and their abandoned shrines in the human heart had been once more lustrated and made pure, that the successive heresies which denied the Divine Humanity were crushed by the reiterated definitions of councils, and that the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation ascended to unquestioned thrones in the zenith of theological science. Now the veneration of Christ's Saints became more distinctly pronounced at the same period—that is, when the doctrine of His Divinity had triumphed. Had the Saints constituted but a new sort of mystified mythology, then, as the reverence for these false Gods advanced, that paid to Christ, as God, must have receded. Christ would Himself have been but regarded as one of the Saints:—nay, in time all prayers to Him might have been condemned as idolatries, or condoned as but pious ejaculations—an impiety only known among the communities which had discarded, long before, the veneration of Christ's Saints. Of all the errors which assail that veneration, the one which fancies it to be a sort of Christian mythology is the one that most ignores its true character, and deprives man of the boundless moral benefits he would derive from it. We shall, therefore, single out this special form of delusion, and direct to it most of our remaining remarks.

All who claim the name of Christians would feel insulted by a laboured argument to show that the Character revealed to us in our Divine Lord (if the term may be used), so far from resembling the Pagan ideal of a divinity, is the opposite of it, whether we regard its measureless height of sanctity, or that abysmal humility and love of suffering which marked Its condescension. How come they not to see that the character expressed in His Saints is no less the opposite of the Pagan ideal? To be godly, and to affect the God-like—these are plainly opposite things. The former is to kneel always; the latter is a perpetual strut. To assert *inherent* might in every movement—

"Neither to change, nor flatter, nor repent" \*

was the differentia of an ideal cast in the imagination of pride.

---

\* *Shelley.*

To have undergone the greatest of all changes, putting off the old man in regeneration :—to live a life that had renounced self the false centre, and which was an eternal adoration of Him Who is the true centre :—to repent of every act, or thought, or idle moment, which wilfully warred against, or suspended, that perpetual adoration for which the created spirit was formed—this was to be the Saint.

Let us look further into this. It was Christianity, we must remember, which not only brought to man the doctrine of the Incarnation, but brought back to him with it that of a Creation. These are the truths that slay idolatry. Lost in its pantheistic dream, Paganism did not know that the world was created; and for this reason every instinct of adoration or of wonder pushed it upon a sensuous idolatry. Nature had indeed lost its true elevation, which belongs to it only as the work and the expression of the one all-holy and infinite God; but even this very loss imparted to it a counter wonderfulness of its own, made it divine, and taught it to wear the mask of a something Infinite and Eternal in which holiness claimed no place. The next stage was that in which pantheism became mythology. The mere material image of the Infinite fatigues and overpowers — this image soon broke itself up into fragments, which assumed a separate vitality; and from clear wave and shadowy boughs, Divinities—at heart but nature still—looked forth in the form of Nereid or Dryad. It was a worship without awe; for the imagination did not interpret only, but had created that which it adored. It was a poetry that had substituted itself for religion, and taken its name; a poetry which had linked itself with the hopes and fears of man—one that gave a luminous projection to his thoughts, and preserved the relics of precious things lost, but one that glorified no less low passions and base appetites. It was a poetry which ever gilt the object on which it gazed; but which, whilst it exulted in admiration for all things, could never rise even to the idea of a true adoration, because the supernatural, which is the object of adoration, cannot exist where the thought of a Personal God abides no more. But man, though deluded by a false religion, was not satisfied by it. The God Whom conscience demanded was something more than the easy divinities whom fancy had decorated with her wreaths; and a Parnassus the radiant beauty of which was but the mellowed and painless reflex of earthly life, left man—the self-worshipper—to pine away with the fate of Narcissus. Nature herself made confession that she was both more and less than her worshippers had supposed, and hinted that the gulf between the sphere of

finite things and an infinite Creator could not always remain impassable. Man cherished a "fearful hope" that behind the veil of the sense there remained divine realities. These realities at last came to him through a religion that addresses the spirit of man not the sense, and which addresses it, not through the pride of the imagination and intellect, but through faith, which is the humility and the submission of both. Christ was "the Desire of the Nations"—not the least significant of His titles. In all those legends which typified an Incarnation, and preeminently in the Rite of Sacrifice, even the Pagan religions had preserved a memory of the primal prophecy. It had beheld the "Woman" and the "Seed" who was to bruise the head of the serpent. She who was, in becoming the Mother of God, to "destroy all heresies," was also to destroy all idolatries.

When the "Desire of the Nations" had come,—when "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us,"—that thirst which had created idolatry, tormented the human heart no more. The World, not the sensualized imagination, became then the chief snare. It was announced to us that "covetousness is idolatry";—nay, that those who prefer human to heavenly ties are idolators: and warning was given of an age in which each man should worship his own self, exalting this idol above both natural and supernatural objects of love. It is the "arch-mock" of the old Spirit of Delusion, when he persuades a world which for eighteen centuries has been lifted up to a plane of higher lights and of darker shades,—of richer graces and of more insidious temptations,—to arm its vigilance against those snares which beset its infancy, and to ignore those which ensnare its maturity and corrupt its decline.

While dealing with the charge of idolatry, in connection with the veneration of the Saints, and dealing with it by opposing a sound philosophy to a prejudiced and passionate rhetoric, it has been necessary, though at the cost of what may seem a digression, to illustrate the origin and real nature of idolatry. To apply our remarks to the question before us, the Saintly Character. When the Elect of Creatures had given her Consent—"be it done unto me according unto thy word:" when at this new "Fiat," the echo of that primal "fiat lux," the Divine Purpose had its fulfilment, it was not only the doctrine of the Incarnation, but the analogous doctrine of a Creation and a Creator, which became the imperishable heritage of redeemed man. The Creator had assumed a created nature. There had been an impassable gulf between the finite and the infinite, and that gulf was bridged by the

great Pontiff,\* who was divine at once and human. Through a Divine Priest only could the world offer up a worthy tribute of praise to Him for whose glory it was made. The world was not created that it might remain for ever at an infinite distance from the Creator, but that it might be brought infinitely near to him, and thus become a portion of His Divine Kingdom. This primal decree was accomplished when the Creator had become the Good Shepherd, and brought home on His shoulder the Creation, like a lost sheep, to the throne of God.† Some of the schoolmen maintained that there would have been an Incarnation, though not of course an expiatory one, even though the Fall had not taken place. The Incarnation was thus the complement of the Creation; and the doctrine of the former became inextricably linked with that of the latter. It was an infinite condescension that revealed an infinite elevation. Two mysterious attributes hidden in Him whom no man can see, were expressed in the humility and the Divinity of the “Word made flesh.” There have been men so dull as to find an argument against our Lord’s Divinity in His title “the Son of man.” In a sense every man is a son of man; but what gave significance to the title in Christ, was this—that He was the Son of God, who had *become* the Son of man. In the Incarnation the humility of the Saviour perfected itself at once and for ever. The infinite had entered within bounds; and at the moment of the Annunciation, He who is life itself had subjected himself to death. All that followed, from the crib to the Cross, and from Calvary to the Ascension, was included as in a germ in this divine act of obedience to the Father’s Will. In the character of Christ is pictured forth the unseen Father; and that character means the infinitude of elevation in the infinitude of condescension. If in the Saints we see the image of Christ, the likeness consists mainly in a measureless humility tending to a measureless elevation. The obedience of Christ cannot be the object of our thought except when we grasp also the thought of that Father to whom He was obedient:—so the humility of the Saints can find no access to our mind without the correlative thought of Him in whom alone His members have their being, Whose merits alone give them merit, and in whose grace alone they are strong. Saints are, of all men, those who have least of the demi-god about them. We may forget the *dependance*

---

\* The word “Pontiff” is derived from *pons*, bridge.

† This subject has been illustrated with great depth and beauty by the Padre Ventura, in some of the “Conferences” delivered by him in Paris.

of an ordinary man ; but that of a Saint is the essence of his character. In other words, the Saint, in place of resembling the Pagan conception of a God is a living protest against it.

Let us look at this more nearly. In proportion as the idea of God, the "Creator of heaven and earth," stands distinctly before us, we must needs see with a growing clearness that all creaturely perfection consists in dependance, not in innate and self-asserting might. In recent times, as Pantheism has been superseding a belief in a creative God, the Pagan ideal of human character has been re-asserting itself ; and what is the consequence of this ?—an avowed and boastful Hero-worship ! Men who refused to yield "honour where honour is due," and to reverence God's Saints, have expiated their irreverence by becoming "a servant of servants"—by rendering a servile adulation to those false Gods of this world who perhaps in their day had themselves been the most servile to human opinion. The doctrine of a Creation is included in Theism, and as such it was revealed to the Patriarchal Church, though for us it hardly exists except in connection with Christianity, in which it is re-revealed. To a true Theist, God is the Living One, the Personal, the All-Holy :—to believe in Him means to worship Him ; and the only relation which even the imagination can attribute to the creature in connection with his Creator is that of a kneeling adoration. Suns and systems are but as transient motes that sparkle in his beam. The life of the creature is hidden in the Creator : He lives in proportion as he is united with that Creator : that union can only exist as the union of dependance ; and the closer it is, the less can the creature claim anything of a separate light. As the rainbow hangs suspended on the luminous mist, so that glory of His Saints, which evermore surrounds the King of Saints, rests evermore upon the bosom and breath of His glory. Not only it cannot exist, but it cannot be conceived of, except as the reflection of that glory inherent, after His resurrection, in the triumphant Humanity of Him Who has given to those who serve Him that they should sit with Him "in His throne judging the twelve tribes of Israel." How can the nature of such a greatness be misapprehended ? Is there a peasant who does not know that what the Saints are, they are through their extraordinary gifts of *grace*, and through their submission to grace ? Now grace obviously means dependance ; he who possesses it most is but the most conspicuous sign, pointing to Him from whom it comes.

The humility of the Saint is not merely, like that of the ordinary Christian—a deep sense of his own sins or shortcomings,—it is the intense appreciation of the essential

nothingness which belongs to the creature, as such. For this reason it increases as sinfulness diminishes and sanctity advances, until he who is well nigh entering on his reward has hardly a sense of his own existence, except as a modulated dependancy—the echo of some Word which God has spoken, and which still vibrates on His breath. “I am that which Is,” our Lord said to a Saint in vision, “and thou art that which seemeth to be.” If this marvellous sense of nothingness were not their protection, the Saints might at once be subverted by that pride which smites most, like lightning, the loftiest summits; and their fall would be, like that of the Apostate angels, the sin of a moment and a sin of thought. Their sense of nothingness is but an intense realization of God’s attributes. It comes from that piercing insight with which they contemplate His greatness, in comparison with which all created things are infinitesimal—His absolute being, in comparison with which all finite things are but relative—and His everlasting might, in comparison with which the forces of creation, their actions and reactions, are but things seeming, except so far as they are instrumentalities put into vibration by His Divine Energy. But as God’s Providence always co-operates with His Grace, that sense of their own nothingness is also externally guarded by the humiliations, afflictions, or temptations which are sent or permitted to the Saints that their purification may be the more rapid, and no less by the obscurity which commonly enshrouds them on earth.

This last reflection receives its best illustration in the Blessed Virgin. What we find is but what the analogy of faith might have predicted, viz., that she through whom took place that Incarnation which is the source of all created sanctity, was not only herself the highest example of such sanctity, but also the most signal proof that here on earth the higher the sanctity the thicker is the veil which protects it. With a few remarks on this subject we shall conclude.

The character of Mary has in it one quality which reminds us of that which belongs to her Son’s Divine Humanity. In the other Saints, as has been remarked, there is a coloured, refracted ray from His sanctity; in her there is a full-orbed glory, though faint compared with her Son’s—a paler reflex from Him Who is the reflex of His Father. We all know what Mary is, yet few could define it. If we try to do so, we speak less of special qualities than of those elementary characteristics inherent in her being and office. As we speak of Her Son’s divinity and His condescension, rather than of



this or that virtue, so in musing on her we think of her creaturely elevation, and again of her mysterious lowliness and absolute abnegation of self. Even the world goes on repeating that it was the idea of Mary that elevated womanhood, and led the way to a spiritual civilization;—yet what that idea was it can hardly answer in detail. The thought of her trembles on the surface of its troubled intelligence like the dawn upon a lake. In its knowledge, and even in its ignorance, it is reverential. It reverences in her the image of her Son. It recognizes also her own image in the Saints, and in those most like the Saints upon earth. The controversialist alone is bitter when he treats of her. The world, so far as it does not absolutely disown its Divine Lord, pays a homage it scarcely intends to pay to the great Maternal Sanctity. This is not wonderful. The world is protected even by indifferentism itself from some aberrations—from that distorted vision, for instance, which is produced by polemical fanaticism; and the common sense on which it prides itself teaches it that the Religion of the Incarnation must ever be, what it has ever been, the cause of “*Jesus and Mary.*” Now it is disbelief only, not unbelief, which is prepared wholly to cast off Christianity. In England, where unbelief is, with a pathetic frequency, involuntary, few, even among those who have lost all definite Christian faith, renounce the *name* of Christianity. This reluctance is not hypocrisy, but a shadowy after-presence of posthumous faith. In the South, Disbelief commonly comes of malice;—in the North, long since defrauded of its heritage, there often exists, even for those who sit most in the shadow, a secondary Christianity—one made up of social traditions, imaginative sentiment, religious good sense, and a half-spiritual philosophy—one, indeed, which in all lands girdles society with an outer circle, like the rainbow beyond the rainbow, and one which, in the case of those who are entering the dark valley of Doubt, remains long visible after that of which it is a reflection is unseen.

Let us now see how what has been said of the Saints applies to the Queen of Saints. In every gradation of being, its characteristic nature is most clearly expressed in the highest specimen of it. Among the Saints themselves there are degrees; and she through whom God became Man rises above the rest in that hierarchy, as they rise above ordinary Christians. It is consequently in her whom a blundering malevolence has most often stigmatized as a goddess, that we find in their highest degree everything that stands in the most significant contrast with the Pagan mythology. In the Blessed Virgin there existed two things pre-eminently—in her inner

life the profoundest sense of a creature's essential nothingness—and in her outer life an obscurity which guarded her greatness from unworthy eyes, and which veils it still from such as have not the insight of faith. Other Saints lived by grace; but, from the moment when the angel saluted Mary as “full of grace” to that when the Church in its latest definition attributed her exemption from Original Sin to an extraordinary grace, based on the foreseen merits of Christ, the very name of Mary has been a synonym for grace. Mary had all the virtues in their perfection; but it was her Humility that especially qualified her to be the instrument of the Incarnation. In the same breath in which she spoke of her destined exaltation—“all generations shall call me blessed”—it is but in her own unworthiness that she can find the reason that God crowned her with the highest gift of which a creature can be capable. Mary was not only *a* creature, but incomparably the most *creaturely* of creatures;—and for that reason she was made the highest of creatures. Her whole being was a glorified dependance; her very name has ever been a relative name—the “Mother”—and points by necessity to the Son.

That Maternity which was the crown of Creation, and the way by which its Creator became its Redeemer,—thus constituting in the eternal decree the highest point which can be reached by an excellence limited to the creaturely—conferred upon Mary a greatness more secret than that of her Son's apostles and early martyrs. Though against their will, these last became conspicuous; they preached their Lord, and died for Him; and a world which did not know them as His Saints, revered them as His warriors, just as the sects often venerate, not indeed the Saint, but the evangelizer of a nation, or the teacher of the school—accepting the visible work and forgiving the contemplation and the mortification in which it was rooted. But Mary was not apostle or martyr. When the Holy Spirit descended at the Feast of Pentecost there was in her, so far as we know, no miraculous endowment, no visible exhibition of grace. On Calvary, when her Son offered Himself, she stood at the foot of the cross, and in that mysterious “Compassion” offered Him also; nay, from the hour when the sword of Simeon pierced her heart, the shadow of that martyrdom had never ceased to hang about her brightness. Yet visibly she wore not with Agnes nor with Agatha the martyr's crown. And why? Because the higher greatness needs not the lower, and the highest is lost in light. Inferior gifts would have been subtractions from, not additions to the immeasurable gift of the Divine Maternity. The greatness of Paul or of Stephen would not be augmented if the world

had been filled with illustrations of their lesser gifts. That which we know of God's servants is *their work*. The work allotted to Mary was the Divine Maternity. Those who admit that this gift was hers yet see nothing in it, who speak as if it was her's by accident, and might have equally been another's—whereas it was her's by an original predestination, with her solemn consent, and in concurrence with that plenary grace which prepared her for it,—those who believe that not a sparrow falls to the ground without God's will, yet who find nothing noteworthy in the highest elevation to which God has ever advanced the creature formed in His own image—such persons “have eyes and see not.” The reason of this blindness is that they are not deep-hearted. Their blindness would not have been less, though it would have been different, had Mary been visibly illustrated by all manner of lesser and accidental gifts. They might in that case have classed her with Deborah or Miriam—a more hopeless delusion than their present one.

Whence comes this blindness? In the main from the superficiality of the unspiritual intelligence. Whence comes the latter? Putting aside the force of that prejudice and those “traditions of men,” by which so many excellent persons are held in thralldom (things not in question here), it comes from hardness of heart. To believe vitally in matters of religion, one must love:—“With the heart man believeth unto salvation.” As Christianity built upon the heart originally, so it must vanish out of the world—and the process may be so gradual as to be imperceptible—in proportion as a decay of charity, and therefore a restored self-love, make the heart superficial by making it hard. The Pagan nature was hard, harder even in the polished Greek than in the rough Roman, and for this reason it was superficial and vain. No one of discernment can enter a gallery of antique sculpture without recognizing the hard-heartedness of Greek art. It reminds us of the Syren's cruelty. Greek Art loved the beautiful, and could, on occasion, show forth the terrible: but the pathos that everywhere underlies human life it could not feel, or it chose to ignore. The Pagan philosophy was like the Pagan art. It was superficial and hard, and for that reason it was vain. It was proud of the body and proud of the mind; and in a balanced condition of both it placed its ideal of perfection. But Christianity exalted the Soul, in which alone is to be found the characteristic excellence of humanity. The mind is a feverish activity within a petty sphere: the soul has a passive power, in the depth of which lies the boundless receptivity of Faith. In

what Paganism would have despised as the soft, the feeble, the *womanly* in human nature lay that which united with weakness the strength conceded to weakness, and the gift of spiritual fruitfulness. It is from superficiality, hardness of heart, and consequent lack of insight, not from any real force in the objections it urges, that the modern intelligence so often fails to see the greatness of Mary. It fancies itself shocked when she is called the "highest of creatures;" yet if a German mystic undertook to prove that S. Michael or S. Gabriel were the highest of creatures, it would find nothing alarming in such an elevation. Nay, if it chanced to light on a text or two which, in its estimation, assigned that rank to the Blessed Virgin, with a better theology a whole world of false philosophy might, perchance, melt like mist; and those who have persuaded themselves that the veneration of the highest creature puts her in the place of God might discover—what a true Theism teaches the child and the peasant—viz., that between the Infinite and the Finite, whether in the highest or the lowest example of the latter, the distance must ever remain infinite. It might next discover that, apart from all direct texts, in the hierarchy of creatures the highest place must needs belong to her through whom the Creator received a created nature. In the Incarnation the spheres of the Infinite and the Finite touched at a point. In the finite sphere that point was Mary. In this truth it might discover that there is a significance. Eventually it might come to perceive that, as we descry the starry firmament best when standing upon some tower that lifts us above the street-roofs, although our distance from it is not sensibly less than it would be if we stood in the streets below, so man is enabled to form his least unworthy conceptions of an excellence illimitable and infinite, when he occupies the vantage-ground afforded to him by a familiar acquaintance with the highest excellence included within the limits of the creaturely and the finite.

The superficial habit of mind referred to is instructively betrayed by the reiterated demand why the claims of Mary were not clearly set forth by her Divine Son whilst yet upon earth. They were not set forth clearly, because it was a necessary part of His design that they should be invariably concealed—as His own greatness was. He concealed His Divinity, and spake darkly and in parables. He bade those who beheld but hints and emblems of His greatness to "tell no man." From all His words and acts there looked forth a light of Divinity; but around them all there also hung a cloud which shrouded that Divinity. When one only of those Apostles who had long walked with Him made the

Church's great confession of that Divinity, His answer was that such insight came not from flesh or blood, but was a gift from the Father. How would it have been possible to reveal His mother's greatness, and not reveal His own? What was her greatness? Was it that she was the mother of a great Prophet? No! To be the mother of the greatest child of earth that the Jew of old, or the later Nestorian, could conceive—this was *not* Mary's greatness. She was not the mother of the highest mere creature; she was herself the highest in the scale of mere creatures, because the Creator was, in His humanity, her Son. To have revealed her motherhood would, therefore, have been to have revealed His Divinity. The Son and the Mother were hidden, not in one darkness, but in one glory.

Our Lord was supposed by those about the Holy House to have been the child of Joseph as well as of Mary. He concealed the fact that he had no human father because he concealed His Divinity. A prophet—nay, the restorer of Israel—might have been born as all men are: but Christ was Incarnate God. He concealed the virginal Maternity of Mary, as even the modern intelligence acknowledges. Is it, then, wonderful that he should have concealed her Divine Maternity also? But this, and the grace that had fitted her for this, constituted alone her greatness. Between revealing all and concealing all no intermediate is conceivable.

How much more wonderful ought it not to seem that Incarnate God remained Himself so long concealed, not only from those whom He had healed, or taught, but from those who had left all to follow Him! It was not His will to burst in splendour on a dazzled world. In all His acts and words we find at once that which gave the knowledge of Himself, and that which withheld it. "His hour was not come." He fed the multitudes miraculously, yet he suffered hunger and lived on alms. He walked over the waves of the sea, yet when in peril from men he conveyed himself away secretly. He strengthened the weak and wiped away the mourner's tear; yet He willed Himself to suffer the passions both of fear and grief. It was so also with His words:—now he said "The Father and I are one;" and now, "these things knoweth no man, not even the Son, but the Father." Not only those who walked with Him in the days of His humiliation did not know Him, but even now, after His kingdom has been established for eighteen centuries upon earth, multitudes deny His Divinity, and vindicate that denial out of the Gospel; while other multitudes who think that they believe it, disbelieve it, unconsciously assigning to Him a double Personality as

well as two Natures, and denying, consequently, that His Mother is the "Mother of God." Holy Scripture is confessedly appealed to both by those who assail and those who confess the Divinity of Christ. It is appealed to no less by those who assail and those who confess the greatness of Mary. As to the place assigned to others in the Scriptures—to Moses, to David, to S. Paul, or S. John, there is no doubt. The Bible is only challenged on both sides in the case of those two whose position, though infinitely unequal, was alike exceptional—the Creator Incarnate and the creature who was made the instrument of the Incarnation. An eminent prelate of the Irish Establishment, Dr. Jebb, Bishop of Limerick, who, with Mr. Alexander Knox, in some sort anticipated the High Church movement in England, made a striking remark in one of his works. The Roman Catholic Church, he said, despite the errors he attributed to it, had been preserved by a special Providence, because it alone was found to be the inexpugnable citadel of the doctrine of the Trinity; the various Protestant bodies having always betrayed a tendency to Arianism or Unitarianism. No wonder that it should be thus with them. Arguments strictly analogous to those urged against the greatness of Mary are used against the Divinity of her Son; and the same general objection is made, viz., that so great a mystery, if revealed at all, must needs have been revealed plainly. We meet, too, identically the same misconceptions. "What you give to Mary," one objector urges, "you take from Christ." "What you give to Christ," the Socinian adds, "you take from God."

What an estimate of the Bible have they formed who fancy that the greatness of Mary is nowhere to be found in it! They read it as superficially as the book of Nature is read by one who says, "I can see with my own eyes, and I see plainly that the earth does not move, and that the sun does move." The Bible would be a shallow book if every confident person could wade across its depths. The greatness of Mary is, indeed, to be found in it nowhere—unless it be found everywhere. The Sadducee could not find the doctrine of a Resurrection throughout the whole of the Old Testament: but our Blessed Lord showed him that it was implicitly confessed, not only in such texts as "I shall go to him," or "in my flesh I shall see God," but in the words most familiar to every child of Hebrew race, "the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob." Is the Old Testament the promise of the Messiah, and the New Testament the record of that Messiah, and do they yet report nothing of her greatness through whom the Messiah came? It is in vain to say "we cannot find it:" there are those who cannot



find God Himself throughout His whole creation ; while there are others who recognize Him in every act of His Providence. In the Word, as in the works of God, there is light for those who can see, and darkness for those who will not.

Our Lord lived in solitude with His mother for thirty years ; yet reading chiefly of the three years of His ministry many persons imagine that He had separated Himself from her who alone knew Him, and from whom only he had known the sympathy of one moment. He wrought His first miracle at her desire ; yet she alone knew what was in His thought ; and to the wedding guests His words probably seemed to refuse her petition. A woman in the crowd lifted up her voice in praise of one whom she deemed the mother *of a prophet*. Our Lord made answer that to do God's Will was a thing more blessed than such a privilege. A great writer\* has remarked that all those who believe that Mary did the Will of God, find in those words her highest praise—a proof that in being “full of grace” she had a gift even more blessed than that of the Maternity for which it had prepared her. This is true ; but no less true is that to the crowds He did not reveal either of these twin mysteries. He neither said that in Mary there existed the highest grace and sanctity of which a creature is capable ; nor did He say that she was—not indeed one of the parents of a prophet—but the Mother of Incarnate God. To have revealed the former, would have been to have revealed the latter ; and there are Christians now to whom His words mean but what they meant when first heard by the Jews. Such persons meet with other stumbling blocks also. Several passages, such as those which call the kinsmen of Jesus His *Brethren*, admit of misinterpretation on the part of those who do not know the genius of ancient languages.

The absence of Mary where mention of her might have been expected, has been yet more insisted on—and yet how she appears and re-appears successively at all the most critical junctures of God's Dispensation ! In the primal prophecy another Pair—second in the order of time—first in that of Election—stand before the fallen Pair in the moment of their judgment:—the Woman and the promised Seed, her child. This is the beginning of the Dispensation. S. John beholds her again in those visions in which the fulness of the times passes before Him. She is the Woman pursued by the dragon's rage—the Woman whose Son rules in Heaven. Midway between the beginning and the end is the Sacrifice that redeemed the world ; and here again is

---

\* Dr. Newman.

Mary. In assigning her as a Mother to His beloved disciple, the Fathers affirm that Christ mystically assigned her as a Mother to all those who by adoption are His Brethren, and that in this sense, though in it only, she too “brought forth in sorrow.” Yet in all these instances, with the light there is a shadow, and the veil is only raised for those who will see. In the Bible, it may well be confessed, Mary is both revealed and concealed. It is thus that, both in his mortal life and in his history, a Saint is at once a glory of God manifested, and a secret of God hidden from men. This heritage of the Saints is part of that reflex, both from Jesus and Mary, which we find to a lesser extent, in all good men. It exists most in the best and greatest—more in those who have preserved their first innocence than in the great penitents; more in the contemplatives than in those active orders whose labours lie among external things. We might pursue the same principle yet further. True virtue lacks a certain glitter that often belongs to false virtue:—it has not its imposing gait, nor its fearless self-satisfaction. Again—the sincere, though very imperfect Christian often shows to less advantage than the mere man of the world. The former halts between divided aims: the latter has a perfect unity of purpose.

But what are lesser marvels compared with the true marvel, The God-man? Who would not have expected that His glory would have irradiated the world, even as in devout pictures a light proceeding from the new-born Saviour shines upon the dusky stable, the crib, and wondering beasts? Yet it was not so. The moral, like the material, glory was restrained. The light that invested Him during His Transfiguration, when the discourse was of that death which He was about to consummate at Jerusalem, this anointing for His grave was the sole token of that essential glory which he had refused to let forth during all the days of His earthly sojourn. That obscurity lasts still:—many who admit the heroic greatness of a Francis Xavier, and who claim the name of Christians, reject the Divinity of Christ! He walked among men, and to many He seemed less than man, “the scorn of men;” while to the rest He seemed man only. As He then hid His Divinity from the sensuous eye, so now in the Blessed Sacrament He hides His Humanity itself beneath its material symbols. Such is His mysterious Will! Those who saw Him pray did not know that God prayed in that human nature which He had assumed; those who saw Him sharing S. Joseph’s toils, did not know that the Creator of the worlds was shaping the humblest appliances needed for man’s estate; those who saw Him obeying His Mother did not know that in

His Divinity He was inspiring every wish of hers which was a law to Him in His Humanity—even as in His Divinity He was sustaining the universe, while in His Humanity a little spot of earth gave support to His feet. Those who stood by the Cross did not know that “the Blood of God” had been shed. It was not exclusively the blindness of sin, which wrapped the cloud around Him:—it was His Will also. Yet that cloud might have been deeper far. As the “outcast of the people” He was not so deeply veiled as He would have been, had He come as a Conquering King or National Deliverer. As such the people hailed Him; but even at that hour, ignorance was turning into self-willed error, and soon afterwards the Hosannas were changed into a cry of “Crucify Him.” In all things He was like His Father; and even while in one sense He was that Father’s manifestation to men, in another sense He remained secret like that Father Whom no man hath seen at any time. “He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.” There is a twofold significance in this saying. All those whose eyes had rested on Christ had seen, whether they knew it or not, the Image of the Father. Yet again, among all those whose eyes had thus rested on Him there was not one who could truly see Him—see Him as God—except through the Spirit of God.

The obscurity of the God-man on earth had but one parallel—that of earth’s highest creature. Hers was a part of His. In her Son alone the Divine was united to the Human—in her alone of creatures were united the two glories of Virginity and Motherhood. In His hand the sceptre of the Mediatorial Kingdom was invisible; and on her head the Creature-Crown was invisible. As soon as her Son allowed but glimpses of His glory to shine abroad, though but in powers accorded also to mortal men—miracles for example—there was stirred up out of the depths that hatred which made the Jews desire to slay Lazarus also whom Christ had raised from the dead. In part only He allowed His Apostles to be known, and they perished. Those who wonder why our Lord permitted the veil to rest upon His Mother while she remained on earth wonder why He had not destined Her to the martyr’s death. The marvel of marvels is the dual obscurity in which the Incarnate God and the Queen of Creatures dwelt for those thirty years in the silent house. For the second Adam and the second Eve of a renewed creation an instinctive reverence may have existed even among those who knew them not—but little more. As the leopard or the lion drew nigh to our first parents in the sinless garden—eyed them for a moment—and then passed by to sport with its kind, or to slumber, so upon

Jesus and Mary may the wayfarer from Bethany, or the neighbour at Nazareth, have cast a casual regard. But they remained unknown. To the mind that judges by sense they must ever remain unknown.

---

---

ART. IV.—MINOR DOCTRINAL JUDGMENTS.

*Idealism in Theology.* A Review of Dr. WARD'S Scheme of Dogmatic Authority. By H. J. D. RYDER, of the Oratory. London : Longmans.

*A Letter to Rev. Father Ryder on his Recent Pamphlet.* By WILLIAM GEORGE WARD, D. Ph. London : Burns & Oates.

*"When does the Church Speak Infallibly?"* By THOMAS FRANCIS KNOX, of the Oratory. London : Burns & Oates.

*Letters on Infallibility in the Westminster Gazette and The Tablet.*

"WHY have you gentlemen of the DUBLIN REVIEW thought  
" fit wantonly to disturb the peace? Things were  
" going on tranquilly and healthily, and real loyalty to the  
" Holy Father was everywhere on the increase, when you  
" began to undermine that loyalty by your exaggerated theories.  
" A Catholic, it may be, did not say in so many words that  
" doctrinal Encyclicals are infallible; but as a matter of course  
" he accepted their doctrine as *if* infallible. He no more  
" suspected them of error, than a child suspects his father's  
" instructions; and as you would only perplex a child by  
" trying to force down his throat some stringent theory  
" about the paternal authority, so also in the parallel  
" instance."

Such in effect is a remonstrance, which has been addressed to us by more than one person, for whom we feel deep respect and deference; and we are eager promptly to avow that if facts had been as the objection supposes, the course we have taken would be incapable of defence. But whatever may have been the case at an earlier period, we are confident that when first we called attention to this theme, such a supposition was extremely wide of the truth. At that time, as now, it was very far from being the universal habit of thinking Catholics in England, to study the contents of each successive Encyclical, and place it in absolute supremacy over their thoughts and convictions. On the contrary, many did and do think, that while nothing should be said publicly in direct disparagement of its authority, it is nevertheless as a matter of course

to be ignored; and Catholic speculation is to proceed altogether irrespectively of its instruction.\*

In fact this very circumstance is forcibly implied in an objection, which has far more commonly been brought against our course. "You are introducing among English Catholics," it is said, "quite a novel and unheard-of doctrine." *These* objectors at all events, for the last year or two, have made their voices pretty distinctly heard; and it is plain on the surface, that they assume as a fact the direct contradictory of that allegation, which our own friendly monitors have urged. We think that facts really lie between the two. There has been a far larger class of English Catholics than these noisy critics suppose, who have ever held confidently and explicitly the infallibility of Encyclicals. But there have also been very many whom the question takes by surprise; as well as a certain not inconsiderable number, who have adopted (what we must call) the heterodox theory on which we just now commented. It is not at all strange that this question has taken by surprise very many English Catholics. It is only in recent Pontificates, that the particular channel of Encyclical Letters has been chosen to any great extent, for the purpose of conveying doctrinal instruction. Moreover even now they have generally but little which bears on theology proper; though they abound in doctrinal guidance on those various philosophical and politico-religious questions, which at this day so intimately concern the Church's interests. Now in England, from obvious causes, until a very recent period there has been little or no controversy between Catholic and Catholic, on such points as these; and naturally enough therefore, there has been no very lively or emphatic tradition on the authority of Encyclicals. But look at countries where such discussions have been frequent—look at France, Germany, and Italy—you will find a very different state of things. Take for instance, in Germany, that distinguished writer Mgr. Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence. He is no "extreme" theologian; on the contrary, he is one of those whom the Abbé Morel criticized in the "*Univers*" as "liberal Catholics." Yet he has been recently taking pains to prove, that there is nothing in his principles on toleration (as there undoubtedly is not) which brings him into any kind of collision with the Encyclical and Syllabus; and his language

---

\* F. Ryder indeed admits, with evident sincerity, that Encyclicals are entitled to most respectful attention (p. 16): but then he thinks that in fact they teach nothing at all. "They do not enunciate any new truth, or even any new logical development of an old truth" (p. 18).

implies throughout the infallibility of those documents.\* Look at France and the controversies there prevalent, whether on the rights of civil rulers, or on the due relation between Church and State. Whichever side is taken by a good Catholic—be he Parisis, Morel, or Godard—he always accepts it as a first principle, that the “*Mirari vos*” and other similar utterances convey the Church’s infallible voice. But why cite individuals? Examine the case of Lamennais, and see with what complete accord the French Church accepted the Pontifical Encyclical as his infallible condemnation; and remember also the singularly harmonious episcopal language on the Encyclical and Syllabus of 1864. Well: all that we have wished has been, that that tradition on the infallibility of such Papal utterances, which has never been impaired in France, in Germany, or in Italy, may be no less firmly and habitually established in Catholic England.

But we would further point out, that even those who think the discussion undesirable must admit it to have been inevitable. No one can say that the matter has been unimportant, over which the instruction of these Pontifical Acts has extended. Take, e. g., the Munich Brief, which occasioned our own first article on the subject. That Brief teaches (1) that Catholics in pursuing secular science should ever have Revelation before their eyes as their guiding light; (2) that due adhesion to revealed truth cannot be obtained by merely accepting definitions of faith; (3) that the act of Divine faith itself must be extended, beyond these, to every thing taught as divinely revealed by the Church’s ordinary magisterium; (4) that those who give themselves to science are bound to accept with interior assent the doctrinal decrees of a Pontifical Congregation;† and (5) that when men disparage, as some German

\* We translate from the French translation. “*L’Allemagne après la Guerre de 1866, par Mgr. de Ketteler.*” Here are one or two extracts:—

“It is necessary to examine whether this religious situation does not contradict *the principles of the Church*; particularly *those of the Encyclical and Syllabus*. In general we think it useful, in order that we may *tranquillize the consciences* of many Catholics . . . to inquire to what length” they can go in this matter of religious liberty “without offending *their religious principles*, and in particular *the principles of the Syllabus*. . . . *The whole doctrine* of the Holy See on this subject” is not “found *entire* in the Encyclical.”

“In writings on the Syllabus men have not sufficiently reflected . . . that all the propositions are derived from previous Apostolic Letters . . . to which [the Pope himself] refers us for each proposition,” &c. &c. (pp. 133–136).

† “*Sapientibus Catholicis opus est ut se subjiciant, tum decisionibus quæ ad doctrinam pertinentes à Pontificiis Congregationibus proferuntur, tum, &c.*”



Catholics have done, the value of scholastic theology, they place in jeopardy the very authority of the Church. This solemn pronouncement so directly conflicted with the tenets of one school among English Catholics, that its organ, "The Home and Foreign Review," was precipitately brought to an end; though the editor professed to yield the Papal teaching no interior assent whatever. Nor can we understand how any intellectually earnest Catholic, of whatever school, can possibly have heard of such instruction, without diligently inquiring what authority it possesses over his interior convictions. The Holy Father himself, by the very fact of publishing it, pressed this inquiry upon his spiritual children; and a Catholic Review which had shrunk from its consideration would have shirked one of its primary duties.

But the Munich Brief fades into insignificance, when compared with that which so speedily followed it: viz., the Encyclical and Syllabus. Here were eighty condemned propositions, embracing a very large number of philosophical and social errors, sent round by the Pope's command, in order that every bishop in Christendom might warn his flock against them. By this great Act, the Pope must necessarily have intended to bring urgently before the attention of his children the extent of his own infallibility. Nor do we see how any educated Catholic, who was not totally indifferent to his religion, could have become cognizant of this most remarkable utterance, without considering for himself, and inquiring of others, what was the precise nature and degree of its authority.

We have been arguing, as our context requires, not that our own answer to this inquiry was the true one, but that every educated Catholic was obliged (were it only for his own loyalty and peace of mind) to answer it one way or other. At the same time we may incidentally point out, how very indubitable the answer should have been to every Catholic. To be a Catholic, is to hold that the Pope and bishops are our supreme divinely-appointed guides to salvation. On this occasion a number of bishops declare confidently, and as a

F. Ryder indeed considers (p. 60) that these words say nothing of *interior assent*, but "only of exterior submission." In behalf of the contradictory view we urged this argument:—The decree is speaking on the due means for securing "*perfect* adhesion to revealed truths"; which must necessarily include *true and interior* adhesion to them. But how could the mere abstinence from public protest against certain decrees—for this is all which F. Ryder means by "exterior submission" to them—tend ever so remotely towards securing true and interior adhesion to revealed truths? We should have been glad to see F. Ryder's reply to this argument, but he has given none.

matter of elementary Catholic principle, that interior belief in the infallibility of a certain pronouncement is requisite for salvation. The Cardinal Vicar of Rome, addressing under the Pope's eye the Pope's own diocese, heads the list. The "*Quantâ curâ*," on being carefully examined, is found to contain the self-same doctrine.\* No one bishop is heard on the other side so much as in a whisper. To doubt a doctrine so testified, is surely to rebel against the *Ecclesia Docens* and violate your Catholic profession. And certainly a charge of "unduly exercising private judgment"—"encroaching on the Church's office"—"transgressing the province of a Catholic periodical"—is the very last which could imaginably be brought against those, who merely echoed in their own humbler sphere the accents of the whole Episcopate.

However, our present point is only that the question could not have been blinked; that Pius IX., not the DUBLIN REVIEW, forced it on the attention of English Catholics; that it absolutely clamoured for one answer or other. For ourselves we simply laboured, as best we could, to discover *what* was the answer given to this question by Pope and bishops; and to begin this labour (we found) was almost immediately to end it. We have felt all through, and feel now more strongly than ever,† that if any Catholic will but keep his mind fixed on this one issue—the teaching of Pope and bishops—it is simply impossible for him to arrive at any conclusion, substantially different from our own.

Against this conclusion, two different classes of objections are imaginable: objections of detail, and objections of principle. As examples of the former—a distinction may be drawn between the Church's formally expressed doctrinal censures on one hand, and the affirmative teaching of Encyclicals on the other; or between one class of Encyclicals and another; or between Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters. We are very far from denying that arguments of real force are available in behalf of these various distinctions; yet (for reasons which will appear before we close the present series of articles) we cannot think that this class of objection will permanently weigh with candid and truth-loving Catholics. Father Ryder, at all events, discards every attempt of the kind; and raises a broad objection of principle. Encyclicals and other such Acts contain undoubtedly a large amount of teaching, which is intimately connected indeed with revealed dogma, but which cannot be accounted its strictly logical development.

---

\* See p. 284 of our present number. See also the appendix to this article.

† See our first "notice" on the recent Episcopal address to the Holy Father at Rome.

Father Ryder then sweeps them all off the ground, by laying down a general principle. The Church's infallibility, he says, is limited to her performance of these two functions: viz. (1) testifying the Deposit, and (2) deducing from it inferences rigorously logical. He is thus necessarily led to the very extreme measure, of denying her infallibility in all those doctrinal censures which are milder than that of "erroneous."\* It is this more extreme view then which first demands our attention. We will consider in our present article the Church's minor doctrinal judgments as such; and reserve to a future number the question of doctrinal Encyclicals in particular.

The literature of the subject has considerably increased, since we treated it in July. F. Knox, Father Superior of the London Oratory, has written a pamphlet which, we expect, will live long after the details of this particular controversy are forgotten. We have rarely seen an exposition of principles at once so clear, so exhaustive, and so powerful; and in one portion of our present article we shall make large use of its contents. Then there have been very numerous letters in the *Westminster Gazette* and the *Tablet*; and in fact we have never known any theological question to occupy the attention of Catholics for so long a period. Among these writers we would especially mention the name of Dr. Gillow, Dogmatic Professor of S. Cuthbert's Ushaw; who has repeatedly come forward, and whose logic is as irresistible as his facts are unanswerable. Dr. Weathers, President of S. Edmund's College, has contributed a letter, not more remarkable from the writer's high and influential position, than from the solid strength of his argument, and his firm hold of the great truth he has been defending. A writer also, who signs himself "Q," has displayed unusual acuteness and dialectical skill. We cannot be surprised if our opinion is put down to natural prejudice; but we really do think that those who support the same doctrine that we do, have in argument carried everything before them. Yet there is one circumstance, for which we cannot be too grateful to our opponents: we mean the truly Christian and courteous tone which they have undeviatingly maintained. If the present controversy at best is attended by circumstances exqui-

---

\* F. Ryder speaks (p. 52) as though "erroneous *in faith*" were a censure sometimes pronounced distinct from that of simply "erroneous." But we have nowhere met with an instance of the Church pronouncing it. And F. Gautier, S.J. (in the first treatise of Zaccaria's "Thesaurus," diss. 2, c. 2, a. 1), gives a different account of the phrase altogether. He says that in this phrase the word "erroneous" is used *generically* to express all tenets which are theologically unsound; and that these are divided into "erroneous in faith" and "erroneous in morals."

sitely painful, at least no unnecessary suffering has been caused us, by any approach to harshness or bitterness of language. And having now written a somewhat longer prologue than we could have wished, we must proceed with the substance of our argument.

We will begin with establishing the Church's infallibility in those minor censures—censures less grave than that of “heretical”—which she is in the habit of pronouncing.

We are happy to say that, on the basis of our controversy, F. Ryder and ourselves are altogether at one. “I thoroughly concur,” he says (p. 25), “in feeling that if any proposition is indubitably true on Catholic principles, it is that the Church possesses whatever infallibility she claims :” and we are limited therefore, to the very simple inquiry, whether the Church do or do not *claim* the infallibility which we ascribe to her. Moreover, since F. Ryder is not a Gallican ;—since he holds that whatever infallibility is possessed by the Church is possessed also by the Pope ;—we are saved the cumbrousness of referring at every turn to Episcopal assent. The question is exclusively this : does the Pope, or does he not, claim infallibility for all the doctrinal censures which he pronounces ?

We must remember however, that the Church has never *in terms* claimed infallibility, even for her definitions of faith. Neither Pope, nor Council, e. g., has in terms ascribed infallibility, either to the definition of the Immaculate Conception, or to the anathemas of Trent.\* But it is admitted by every Catholic as a first principle, that she *implicitly* claims infallibility, wherever she *explicitly* requires her children to hold interiorly this or that doctrine.† Or, as all non-Gallicans

\* “*Ecclesiæ infallibilitas fundamentalis est fidei Catholicæ articulus, qui non tam directâ et explicatâ definitione, quàm univērsâ docendî agendique ratione ut divinitus revelatus credendus proponitur.*” This is one of the “*Theses de Universâ Theologiâ*” defended at Rome in June last by F. Egidi, S.J.

† A correspondent of the *Tablet*, in reply to an argument of Dr. Ward's, urges that the mere demand of interior assent does not in itself involve a claim to infallibility. Of course we fully concur. A father or a schoolmaster reasonably claims the child's interior assent to his instruction : a doctrinal decree of the Index or Inquisition demands interior assent of a certain kind, though the decree is not infallible. And so F. Ryder himself (p. 24) very reasonably mentions “a certain degree of internal intellectual adherence,” short of that *unreserved* adherence which is due to infallibility. But, as we point out in the text, all Catholics agree that whenever the *Ecclesia Docens* demands interior assent, she claims infallibility ; and all non-Gallicans admit the same concerning a Pope.

Another correspondent proclaims the insufficiency of any argument, which

express themselves, the Pope is infallible whenever he speaks as Universal Teacher, imposing on Catholics the obligation of interior assent. The rationale of this shall be considered before we conclude our article; but every Catholic admits the principle. Now it is really not one whit clearer that the Pope has required interior assent to definitions of faith, than that the Pope has with equal peremptoriness required interior assent to the justice of his minor doctrinal censures. We will prove this (1) from one of the earliest, and (2) from one of the latest instances, in which he has condemned propositions in globo.\*

The Council of Constance then condemned in globo various propositions of Wicklyffe and Hus, as being some heretical, others respectively erroneous, temerarious, seditious, offensive to pious ears. Martin V. confirmed this condemnation, in his well-known Bull "Inter cunctas." In this Bull he calls on the archbishops, bishops, and inquisitors of Christendom, to account as heretics those who should continue to *believe* these propositions.† He then recites the forty-five condemned propositions of Wicklyffe, and the thirty of Hus; and prescribes certain interrogations to be made of any "suspected" of holding those propositions or "detected in asserting them." Of these interrogations the sixth runs thus (Denz. n. 552):—

Whether he believes that whatever the sacred Council of Constance has approved or approves *in behalf of* faith and for the salvation of souls (in favorem fidei et ad salutem animarum), must be *approved and held* by all Christ's faithful; and that whatever [that Council] has condemned and condemns as contrary [in tendency] to faith or good morals, must be held, believed, and asserted by them as being thus condemned.

The eighth (Denz. n. 554):—

Whether he *believes, holds, asserts* that Wicklyffe, Hus, and Jerome of Prague were heretics . . . and that [those] their books and *doctrines* were

purports to prove that the Church claims *by implication* infallibility for this or that utterance; as, e. g., for the "Mirari vos." But the Church does not claim infallibility, even for her definitions of faith, *except* by implication.

\* He is said to condemn propositions in globo, when he brands them generally with various censures, without particularizing which censure is applicable to which proposition.

† Discretionis vestre . . . committimus . . . omnes et singulos . . . qui . . . articulos seu libros et doctrinas præfatorum hæresiarum per Constantiensem Synodum . . . damnatos et damnatas *credere* et dogmatizare præsumpserint, . . . tanquam hæreticos judicetis et velut hæreticos seculari curiæ relinquatis.

and are *perverse*, on account of which . . . [they] were condemned as heretics by the sacred Council of Constance.

Catholics, then, were required to "*believe and hold*" that the condemned doctrines of these men, even those doctrines condemned with minor censures, were and are *perverse*. Lastly, the eleventh (Denz. n. 555):—

Let a man of education (*literatus*) be specially interrogated, whether he *believes* that the sentence of the Sacred Council of Constance on the forty-five articles of Wicklyffe and the thirty of Hus is *true and Catholic*; viz., that the above-named articles *are not Catholic*, but some of them notoriously heretical, some erroneous, *others temerarious and seditious, others offensive to pious ears*.

Ordinary persons, you see, were only required to profess that these tenets were "contrary to faith and morals;" but an educated man was required to profess more distinctly, that they deserved the particular censure which they had received. Lastly the recantation required from Jerome of Prague contained the following:—

I assent to the [teaching of the] Roman Catholic and *Apostolic See* and this Sacred Council . . . that of the above-named articles [those condemned in Wicklyffe and Hus] many are notoriously heretical, *some blasphemous, others erroneous, others scandalous*.\*

There are really few *definitions of faith*, in which the Church has spoken so distinctly on the obligation of yielding interior assent.

We now leap over an interval of many centuries, and bring our readers to the "Unigenitus." This Bull, as is well known, condemns in globo a hundred and one propositions of Quesnel, as respectively "false, captious, ill-sounding, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, temerarious, injurious to the Church and her practice, contumelious not only to the Church but to the civil power, seditious, blasphemous, suspected, nay, savouring of heresy, favouring heretics, heresies, and schisms, erroneous, proximate to heresy, often condemned, finally heretical and renewing various heresies," especially the Jansenistic. The Bull itself is clear enough on the obligation of assent. "We [Clement XI.] command all Christ's faithful that they do not presume to *think*" otherwise than "is

---

\* Quoted by Regnier "Cursus," vol. iv., p. 629.



declared in this our Constitution.” But, if you would have a clearer view of all which was intended, you cannot do better than consult the Bull “*Pastoralis officii*,” issued five years later by the same Clement XI. Firstly, the Pontiff explains what he had intended by condemning Quesnel’s propositions in globo.

“In which [‘*Unigenitus*’] according to the custom of this Holy See, we proscribed many noxious articles [extracted] from the same book, having branded them with various censures which they deserved respectively ; in such sense, namely, that *each of the propositions deserved one at least of the censures.*”

He next states that in the “*Unigenitus*” Peter had spoken through his mouth—i. e., that he had uttered it *ex cathedrâ*—and that the *Ecclesia Docens* had accepted his teaching.\* In a later passage he still more emphatically asserts its infallibility. To suppose, he says, that its decisions can be injurious to faith, discipline, or morals, “is the same thing as to fear lest *the faith of Peter should have failed*, and lest *the whole Church of Christ*, imbued with the magisterium of the Apostolic voice, *should have erred from the way of truth and salvation.*” So surely then as Peter’s faith cannot fail, so surely cannot the determinations of the “*Unigenitus*” contain any error. Finally, he thus concludes :—

“In regard then to all those of whatever state, order, or degree they may be, even though they be adorned with Episcopal, Archiepiscopal, or Cardinalitial dignity, who have hitherto refused, or who hereafter may refuse, due and unreserved (*omnimodam*) obedience to our above-named Constitution—let all men everywhere who boast in the Catholic name know that We who on earth hold the place of Jesus Christ . . . *do not recognise [such men] as true sons of the Roman Church ; nor as adhering to and agreeing with Us and Blessed Peter’s chair ; but on the contrary, hold and account them as openly disobedient and notoriously contumacious and refractory . . . and that We and the Holy Roman Church herself will hold no Ecclesiastical communion with them* until (which God grant) through an exhibition of obedience . . . they may obtain from the same Holy See restitution to their ancient charity and unity.

“To you, lastly, Venerable Brethren, We turn our speech, exhorting and beseeching you in the Lord . . . that you sedulously preserve the flock entrusted you from poisoned pastures. . . . Would that those who have hitherto contended against our paternal voice . . . might [through your

---

\* “*Tota quidem Christi Ecclesia, Petrum per nos quamvis indignos loquentem secuta, Apostolicam ejusdem Constitutionis doctrinam debito obsequio atque obedientiâ recepit.*”

agency] be confounded and converted, and that God might give them repentance *so that they should know the Truth* . . . that, according to the Apostle's teaching, we should at length all say the same thing and there be no divisions amongst us."

There is but one subterfuge which we can imagine any Catholic attempting, who has before his eyes this awful sentence: he may allege that the precept of "unreserved obedience" is fulfilled by "respectful silence." To this however the answer is most easy. (1) The "Unigenitus" in so many words, as you have just seen, forbids Catholics from "thinking" otherwise than according to its determination. That Bull therefore cannot possibly receive "unreserved obedience," at the hand of any one who *disobeys* its principal command. Then (2) the Pope implores, for the recusants, "repentance, that they should know *the Truth*": it was their *interior convictions* then, which required to be reformed. Lastly Cardinal de Noailles, who was then ringleader of the Jansenistic faction, at once admitted (with his brethren) the obligation of "respectful silence";\* but it was not till a much later period, and under a different Pope, that he really yielded obedience to the Holy See. On July 19, 1728, he wrote to Benedict XIII.:—"I submit to the decisions of the Holy See, and sincerely receive the Bull 'Unigenitus,' warned by my grey hairs and *the account I must soon give at the Tribunal of God.*" And on October 11 of the same year he published a Pastoral, declaring it "*unlawful to hold other sentiments than those defined by the Bull 'Unigenitus.'*"† To accept the Bull, you see, was equivalent to considering it "*unlawful to hold other sentiments than those defined*" by it.

But in fact the same Clement XI. who issued the "Unigenitus," had at an earlier period condemned the monstrous proposition, that "respectful silence" is obedience to a doctrinal Constitution. His words refer indeed directly to the dogmatical fact concerning Jansenius; but they have a far wider application. They are from the "Vineam Domini" published in 1705.

In order that *in future all occasion of error be entirely precluded*, and that all children of the Catholic Church may learn to hear the Church not only by keeping silence (*for even the wicked keep silence in their darkness*) but by *interiorly obeying* (*interiùs obsequendo*) which is *the true obedience of an orthodox man*, we . . . declare by our Apostolic authority . . .

---

\* Spalding's Translation of "Darras's Ecclesiastical History," vol. iv., p. 427.

† *Ibid.* p. 450.

that the obedience which is due to the above-named Apostolic Constitution *is by no means satisfied by that respectful silence*; but that the sense of Jansenius's book, which was condemned in those five propositions, should be accounted and condemned as heretical by all Christ's faithful, *not in voice only, but also in heart, &c. &c.*

Here a general principle is evidently laid down. Certain decrees of the Church are disciplinary, and command this or that to be done; certain others are doctrinal, and command this or that to be *believed*. No orthodox Catholic, says Clement XI. in effect, can really *obey* this latter class of decrees, except by assenting interiorly to the doctrine which they contain.

To this express testimony we may add what was mentioned in our last number. The Council of Embrun, specially confirmed by Benedict XIII., called the "Unigenitus" the Church's "dogmatic, definitive, and irretractable judgment;" and added, "if any one does not *assent to it in heart and mind*, let him be accounted among those who have made shipwreck concerning the Faith:" the very phrase afterwards applied by Pius IX. to those who should doubt the Immaculate Conception.

We do not see how it is possible, by any imaginable production of positive authorities, to establish our conclusion more firmly than we have already done; to show more convincingly how serious is F. Ryder's mistake, when he considers that the Church does not claim infallibility for such minor censures, as are contained in the "Inter cunctas" and the "Unigenitus." Of course we are bound to consider carefully any testimony which he alleges from approved theologians on the other side; and to this we devote a separate article in this very number. But it would be really waste of time to give further *positive* grounds for our conclusion, beyond those already adduced. We pass on therefore at once to various inferences, deducible from what has already been said.

1. Firstly then as to the *scope* of these minor censures. On the one hand it is most certain that they are pronounced for no other purpose, than that of enabling the Church to guard the Deposit more securely, and in general to labour more successfully for the sanctification and salvation of souls.\* Indeed, this is often expressed; as, e. g., in the "Inter cunctas;" in the "Pastoralis officii;" in the "Coelestis

---

\* "In favorem fidei et ad salutem animarum." Martin V., "Inter cunctas."

Pastor " which condemned Molinos; and in many others.\* Yet on the other hand, the Church's censures are by no means confined to propositions which *directly* assail revealed dogmata: but extend much further. Those propositions are said to assail revealed dogmata *directly*, which either *point-blank* contradict them, or else contradict them *in the way of strictly logical and necessary consequence*.† Propositions of the first class are condemned as "*heretical*"; and it is now the universal opinion of theologians, that it is propositions of the *second* class which are condemned as "*erroneous*." See Dr. Murray, d. 17, n. 22. But what a vast number of censures still remains! Not only does the Church brand propositions as "suspected" or "savouring" of the "heretical" and the "erroneous;" she infallibly brands them for no heavier offence, than that of being "temerarious," "ill-sounding," or "scandalous;" again, as "disturbing the peace of the soul," or "derogatory to the Church's rights," or "injurious to holy doctors." In fact, if you look over the list of censures which have been pronounced—some seventy or eighty—you will admit that any proposition falls within the sphere of censure, which on the one hand is reprehensible, and on the other hand is in any possible way injurious to the Faith. So Montagne pronounces (Cursus, vol. i. p. 1113) that any proposition can be condemned which is "*fidei aliquo modo nociva*"; and F. Perrone indeed considers this the one accepted definition: ("Vulgo definiti consuevit," De Virtutibus Theologicis, part i. n. 500. See again Dr. Murray, d. 17, n. 53.) We have added indeed explicitly, what Montagne and others of course imply, that no proposition is censurable which is not reprehensible;

\* "Among all the anxieties of our pastoral care . . . this chiefly more grievously oppresses us, that . . . the Orthodox and Catholic Faith may remain whole and unspotted." "Inter cunctas." Then follows presently the censure on Wicklyffe and Hus.

"The care of our pastoral duty . . . admonishes us that we watch with all zeal over the task of *promoting the salvation of souls* throughout the world, and especially of preserving *the purity of that Orthodox Faith* without which it is impossible to please God." "Pastoralis officii." Then follows the reference to Quesnel's condemned propositions.

"The Heavenly Shepherd . . . delivered the Catholic Church to the rule of Peter . . . and his successors, *in order that they might preserve absolutely entire (sartam tectamque) the doctrine learned from His mouth*. . . . Wherefore . . . it has been always our fixed desire that the Christian people should follow that Faith which was preached by Christ the Lord, through the Apostles," &c. Innocent XI. "Cœlestis Pastor." Then follow the various censures of Molinos.

† The meaning of this expression is more precisely considered a few pages further on.

because it is a contradiction in terms, that any thing can be infallibly censured which does not *deserve* censure.

2. We are thus led to a question, which has been recently discussed with some emphasis. Can a condemned proposition be possibly true? Of course there are many condemned propositions, which are most undoubtedly true *in a certain sense*: the question to be considered is—can they be true *in that particular sense in which they have been condemned*? Most strangely some writers, who have argued for the affirmative answer to this question, have done so under an idea, that they shall thus lessen the sphere of the Church's infallibility. But it is evident, on a moment's thought, that the opinion of these writers greatly enlarges that sphere. For on their view the Church possesses a power of declaring with absolute infallibility, that a proposition, though understood in some sense in which it is perfectly true, will nevertheless to the end of time be, under all circumstances, "temerarious," "scandalous," or "ill-sounding."\* However, we will consider the matter on its own merits, and exclusively of such results. It is a perfectly open question, and one on which theologians differ: we must be understood therefore, as merely expressing with deference the bias of our own opinion.

Now as to the vast majority of censures, it is most plain that they imply untruth in the censured proposition: no true proposition can be "blasphemous," "impious," "seditious," "schismatical," &c., &c. Take one of the very mildest, that of "ill-sounding." When the Church infallibly pronounces this censure, she clearly pronounces two infallible judgments: viz. (1) that the censured proposition has a certain appearance of being intended in a certain sense; and (2) that, if it *be* understood in that sense, it is an "evil"—*i. e.*, inclusively an "untrue"—proposition. See Dr. Murray, d. 17, n. 40. But taking the matter generally, to us there seems no imaginable ground but one, on which a true proposition can be in itself †

---

\* "To the end of time," because (as Catholic theologians are in the habit of pointing out) this qualification is often expressed, and always understood. So the Council of Constance put forth a "*perpetuum decretum*"; and Clement XI. condemned Quesnel, "*hâc nostrâ perpetuò valiturâ Constitutione*."

† "In itself reprehensible." Of course there are various other grounds, on which *individuals* may be reprehensible for *holding* some true opinion. It may be contrary e. g., to filial piety, that a son shall believe even on sufficient, though not overwhelming, evidence, an accusation against his father which may nevertheless be true; and there are various analogous cases bearing on the interests of religion. But the Church condemns propositions objectively, not subjectively; *i. e.*, she directly censures the proposition itself, and not the individual who holds it.

reprehensible. That one case of exception occurs, when a proposition, though it may happen to be true, yet is contrary to the weight of attainable evidence; including of course "authority" under the head of "evidence." And it seems to us therefore the more probable opinion, that there is but one censure, that of "temerarious," which can with any show of reason be accounted compatible with the *truth* of what is censured. Now that, *under particular circumstances and for a period*, a true proposition may be really temerarious, is most evident. Thus, in Galileo's time it was undoubtedly temerarious to hold that the earth moves round the sun; because such an opinion contravened the one obvious and the one traditional sense of Scripture, not on the strength of astronomical proof, but in the weakness and license of astronomical conjecture. But, as we have already pointed out, the Church's censures are of perpetual application; and the Copernican theory therefore could not have been censured by her. In pronouncing then a proposition temerarious, the Church pronounces infallibly that to the end of time it will be contrary to the weight of attainable evidence. And whether such a proposition can or cannot be *true*, at all events it follows, from the Church's condemnation, that every Catholic will be under an obligation, so long as he remains on earth, of interiorly rejecting and disbelieving it.

But now let this fact be very particularly observed, which seems entirely to have escaped F. Ryder's attention. Several considerable theologians, no doubt, have held that the mere fact of a proposition being condemned as "temerarious," "scandalous," or the like, does not prove its untruth. But none of them have denied—none of them could possibly have denied—that *the Church herself* may teach in *this or that particular case* the falsehood of those propositions which she censures. She has done so in several instances. Thus, the recent Syllabus is a Syllabus of "errors": no one therefore, of the propositions therein recited, is true in the sense in which it is condemned. The condemned tenets of Wicklyffe and Hus were (as we have seen) infallibly declared "perverse," and therefore untrue; nor was any Catholic permitted to "believe" them. Leo X., in the "Exurge Domine," repeatedly calls Luther's condemned propositions by the name "errors." Clement XI. speaks no less distinctly on Quesnel's.\*

---

\* In the "Unigenitus," just before reciting the propositions. "Nihil propterea opportunius aut salubrius præstari à nobis posse arbitrati sumus, quàm si *fallacem* libri *doctrinam* . . . *pluribus* singulatim ex eo excerptis *propositionibus* distinctiùs et apertiùs explicaremus . . . Ita nimirum denudatis et quasi in propatulo positis non uno quidem aut altero,



And all this adds considerable probability to the opinion of those theologians—far the more numerous—who maintain that in all cases every condemned proposition is certainly untrue.

It may be added that, though this question is in itself of some importance, yet it has no bearing on any conclusion which we have ourselves at any time been especially desirous of urging. The whole doctrine, e. g., on the infallibility of Encyclicals is absolutely unaffected by it: as any one will see, who cares to follow the argument which we shall pursue in future articles.

3. We now come to a somewhat important matter of terminology. Those irreformable judgments of the Church, which brand a contradictory tenet as “heretical,” are called “definitions of faith.” But what name shall be given to those other irreformable judgments, which brand a proposition, not with the note of heresy, but with some minor censure? Many theologians call these by the name of “dogmatic judgments.” Our own objection to this phrase is, that the word “dogma” is not unfrequently contradistinguished from the word “doctrine:” the word “dogma” being confined to the actual Deposit, while the word “doctrine” is applied, not only to the Deposit, but to every truth connected therewith. So Pius IX., in the “*Quantâ curâ*,” uses the phrase “*dogmata fidei et morum*” to express exclusively the actual truths revealed by God. It seems to us extremely convenient, that this distinction should be preserved between the two words; and we think it better therefore to avoid the term “*dogmatic*” judgments. We propose then to use the term “*doctrinal* judgments” as expressing the *genus*; as expressing *all* the irreformable judgments of the Church. This we divide into two different species: viz. (1) definitions of faith; and (2) *minor doctrinal* judgments.

4. Now it is evident that the Church not only expresses doctrinal judgments *negatively*—viz., by condemning this or that proposition—but affirmatively also. Thus the capitula of Trent, as distinct from the canons, contain a long series of infallible

sed plurimis gravissimisque . . . erroribus. . . . confidimus fore ut omnes *veritati* cedere *compellantur*.”

In the “*Pastoralis officii*” he speaks more than once of the “*errores per nos damnati*” in Quesnel.

“T.” writing in the *Tablet*, seems to think it would be a very heavy yoke, if he were required to hold as infallibly certain, that each of the hundred and one propositions is untrue. We cannot ourselves think the obligation a heavy yoke; but at all events there can be no doubt whatever that he is under it.

doctrinal judgments :\* though these are not *definitions of faith*, except when their contradictories are pronounced *heretical*. (See Dr. Murray, d. 17, n. 279.) Indeed she seems to have expressed minor doctrinal judgments in an affirmative shape, long before the custom began of pronouncing minor censures. Thus Boniface VIII.'s Bull, "*Unam Catholicam*," must be admitted by every one not a Gallican as a true and infallible judgment. Suarez indeed speaks of it as "manifest" that this Bull has been "received and approved by the common consent of the Catholic Church." (de Fide, d. 20, s. 3, n. 22) ; and Cappellari (afterwards Gregory XVI.) implies that no Ultramontane at least ever doubted its infallibility.† Yet you can hardly regard all the doctrinal instructions of this "*Unam sanctam*," however infallibly true, as so many definitions of faith ; in such sense that their contradictories are heretical. But precedents apparently extend to a still earlier period. The second Council of Orange (A.D. 529) is admitted by every one to have issued an infallible judgment against the semi-Pelagians : yet surely there are some of its canons which cannot be called definitions of faith. You would not, e. g., pronounce it *heretical*—though it is infallibly *condemned*—to deny that "the fortitude of heathens is caused by their love of this world." (Canon 17.)

---

\* It has sometimes been thought that the capitula of Trent are not strictly infallible ; but Dr. Murray replies conclusively to this opinion, d. 17, nn. 277–8. He quotes the testimonies of Suarez, Vasquez, and Lugo ; and the express words of Pope Pius's "Profession of Faith." But the words of the Council itself are still more decisive. Dr. Murray points out that in each one of the Sessions, which contain both affirmative and negative decisions, the Council's claim of infallibility is as peremptory for the former as for the latter.

† We quote from the French translation of his admirable work "*Il Trionfo della Santa Sedia*." That work is directed against the very extreme Gallican and Liberal party. Its penultimate chapter is an imaginary address from a member of that party to Protestants, inviting them to unite with himself on the basis of a Liberal Catholicism. "Is it not encouraging," asks this imaginary Gallican, "to see a Church so illustrious" as the French, "whose Catholicism is indubitable, utterly disregard the most furious and most terrible menaces of the Bulls, '*Unam Sanctam*' and '*In Cœnâ Domini*,' against those who appeal" from the Pope to a future Council ; "although *the former*, which appeared in 1302, *has for more than four centuries served as a rule to the Catholic universe*?" (p. 279).

It is well known that when Clement V. at a later period made every concession to King Philip which could possibly be made,—when he revoked every adverse act of Boniface VIII. which he could possibly revoke,—he avowed it impossible to touch the "*Unam sanctam*." He only explained, what was of course undeniable, that that Bull in no single respect made the king of France more subject to the Holy See than he had already been.

Whereas then no one can doubt that these minor doctrinal judgments have become immeasurably more frequent in later times—for which, indeed, several sufficient reasons can easily be assigned—yet they are not without precedent in the Church's early history. We will only in conclusion add the obvious remark, that whenever a proposition is condemned as untrue, there is involved an affirmative doctrinal judgment which teaches its contradictory.

We now come to a very important matter, which must be treated in some detail; viz., the *object-matter* of infallibility. In our present article we will say nothing about Encyclicals; we will confine ourselves to condemned propositions, and to those other doctrinal judgments, which all theologians explicitly accept as indubitably infallible. By the help of these various judgments, we are to consider over how large a sphere—over how wide a range of truths—the Church's privilege of infallibility extends. It is necessary to determine this with some precision, in order that our readers may comprehend one of the points at issue between F. Ryder and ourselves.

We must first then consider certain propositions, much mentioned in theology, of which it is said that they are “virtually” or “mediately” revealed; that they are “theological conclusions” in the strictest sense. Some of these are conclusions logically derived from two revealed principles; and on these we need say no more. But there is a second class which we must treat at greater length.

A truth then is said to be “virtually” or “mediately” revealed, if it is the conclusion of a syllogism, whereof one premiss is “immediately” revealed; while the other is either self-evident, or at least “indubitably certain” by the light of reason. We add the phrase “indubitably,” because we think this is always understood by theologians, though not always expressed. In order to account a truth “virtually revealed,” it does not suffice (we think) in the view of theologians, that the non-revealed premiss shall be *in itself* certain: it must be in such sense certain, that all cultivated intellects will at once receive it as true; that its acceptance is as simple a matter of course, as is acquiescence in the very validity of a logical process.\* We could give several reasons

---

\* So F. Ryder (p. 36) is entirely right, we think, in implying that theologians would not regard a truth as virtually revealed, unless its connection with the Deposit were “indubitably certain,” on grounds of reason. We cannot admit that the rest of his sentence contains an accurate statement of facts; but this is a matter wholly external to our present scope.

for our conviction that theologians mean this ; but perhaps one will suffice. F. Ryder truly observes (p. 38) that “ the stock example ” of a virtually revealed truth “ is ‘ risibilitas ’ as a property of Christ in His revealed manhood. ” “ Omnis homo est risibilis ”—non-revealed major ; “ Christus est Homo ”—revealed minor ; “ Christus est risibilis ”—theological conclusion. Now let us suppose for one moment that the major were “ certain ” indeed, but not “ indubitably certain ; ” let us suppose there were a large sect of philosophers, which, however unreasonably, denied the proposition “ homo est risibilis. ” We must further assume that the Church has not condemned these philosophers, directly or indirectly ; and moreover, that Revelation and the Church are altogether silent on the proposition “ Christus est risibilis. ” On such a supposition, no one could say simply and without reservation that the proposition “ Christus est risibilis ” is virtually revealed : it is virtually revealed to one class of philosophers, but not to their opponents.

So far as Lugo is concerned—and there is no more representative writer on such subjects—the following passage will show that he simply took for granted the view which we advocate. He is arguing that a truth, virtually but not immediately revealed, is no object of Divine faith. Against this opinion he says—

It is objected, fifthly, that “ he who should deny Christ to be risible would be treated as a heretic ; therefore it appertains to faith to affirm such risibility. ” The answer is, that such a man is *presumed* a heretic : because it is taken for granted that he does not deny the *evident* natural premiss, “ homo est risibilis, ” but the *obscure* revealed premiss, “ Christus est Homo. ” But if *in fact* he did not deny the latter but only the former, in God’s sight he would *not* be a heretic. . . . Hurtado adds justly, that even in foro externo he would not be punished as a heretic if he were an uneducated (rudis) man, who might be able easily to make a mistake in an evident philosophical premiss. (De Fide, d. 1, n. 267.)

In the case of an educated man then, the Church so simply takes for granted his assent to the non-revealed premiss, that, if he disbelieves the theological conclusion, she at once punishes him as an impugner of the *revealed* premiss. The Church supposes, as a matter of course, that no one can doubt the non-revealed premiss, except a man of uncultivated intellect. So F. Gautier, S.J., author of the admirable treatise which stands first in Zaccaria’s “ *Thesaurus*, ” implies (in a passage presently to be quoted), that the non-revealed premiss must be “ certainly and *indubitably* ” true.

Suppose the theological conclusion thus obtained forms a premiss of some new syllogism; and suppose it is combined with another premiss "indubitably certain" by the light of reason. What is to be said for the conclusion of this new syllogism? We have nowhere observed that theologians answer this question; but it appears to us pretty plain, that this new conclusion would also be called "mediately" or "virtually" revealed.

All theologians are now agreed that an "erroneous" proposition is precisely one which contradicts a "theological conclusion" in the strictest sense of that word.\*

Some writers have recently used the very convenient expression, "actual" and "virtual" Deposit. The meaning of these terms will now be obvious. The "actual Deposit" is the assemblage of those verities, which were immediately revealed to the Apostles, and taught by them to the Church. The "virtual" Deposit is the assemblage of those further verities, which follow by strict logical process from combining the former, either with each other, or with truths "indubitably certain" by the light of reason.

Now if this be accepted as a true definition of the words, it is most evident that the Church's infallible judgments extend over a far wider sphere than this actual and virtual Deposit. For instance, she has pronounced infallibly, that she acted expediently in adding "Filioque" to the Symbol, and in instituting communion under one species. (See p. 293 of our present number.) She has pronounced infallibly, that five certain propositions are contained in Jansenius's book according to its true objective sense. She has pronounced an infallible judgment on the value of universities, studies, colleges, and degrees.† She has pronounced infallibly that Clement IX. never approved the distinction between "jus" and "factum"; and that scholastic theology has been cultivated by most holy men to the great good of religion. ("Auctorem Fidei," props. 13 and 74; Denz, nn. 1376, 1439.) She has pronounced infallibly that various propositions will, to the end of time, be temerarious, scandalous, pernicious, perilous, ill-sounding, and the like. If the

\* "Duplex conditio requiritur ad propositionem 'erroneam.' Prima ut veritas cui opponitur sit *certò et indubitanter* revelata, scilicet mediatè; altera," &c. (Gautier, d. 2, c. 2. d. 3.)

† Viz., in condemning as "perverse" Wicklyffe's 29th proposition: "Universities, studies, colleges, degrees, and masterships in the same have been introduced by a vain heathenism; they are just as beneficial to the Church as the devil is." (Denz, n. 505.)

virtual Deposit be understood in the sense above explained, no one can possibly say that these various instructions fall within its sphere.

Whereas then virtually revealed truths are said to be "directly" connected with the dogmata of faith and morals, there is a further class, within the Church's infallible jurisdiction, which are but "indirectly" connected therewith. We have sometimes been asked to state more precisely, what we mean by this "indirect" connection. On this head, we should be glad to hear the judgment of better theologians than the present writer; but we do not ourselves see how to give any other general statement than that supplied by Montagne and Perrone. These theologians lay down, as we showed, that the Church may infallibly censure a proposition, which is "*in any manner injurious to the Faith.*" So we should say in the larger case of affirmative judgments. The Church—ever acting under guidance of the Holy Ghost—can infallibly declare any true proposition, which is in such sense connected with revealed dogmata, that its interior\* rejection will seriously increase her difficulty in saving souls, or in preserving those dogmata for her flock in their purity and full integrity. So Martin V. (as we have seen), when referring to the Council of Constance which pronounced so many minor doctrinal judgments, uses no more definite phrase to express their bearing on the Deposit, than that they had been put forth "*in behalf of the Faith*" (in favorem Fidei). Pius IX speaks with similar generality in his Letter "*Gravissimas inter.*" "The Church," he says, "has the right and duty of proscribing and condemning *all* errors, if *integrity of the faith and salvation of souls demand this.*" And he proceeds to denounce the contradictory tenet as "erroneous, injurious to the Faith and to the Church's authority." Dr. Murray quotes this (d. 17, n. 42), and speaks afterwards himself entirely in the same sense. "The Holy Ghost," he says, "has been promised to the Church as a guide . . . in order that He might teach her *all* things; that is to say, *all things* which in His Infinite Wisdom *He should judge it suitable* to manifest in order [more fully] to attain the end of the Church's institution" (d. 17, n. 67). In like manner the Würzburg theologians call the "Unigenitus" a "rule of faith in a less strict sense." They

---

\* Let this be remembered. Several theologians hold indeed that there is no obligation of interiorly dissenting from every proposition, which is merely condemned as temerarious, scandalous, &c. But all say there is the strictest obligation of assenting interiorly to the thesis, that such proposition is temerarious, scandalous, &c.



add that "though the Church is *free from all error* [in putting it forth] *because of the Holy Ghost's infallible assistance*, yet it contains *within the sphere of its object any truth whatsoever* (*veritatem quamcunque*), although it may not have been pronounced by God." (De Gratiâ, n. 245.)

Finally we should add that all truths connected with the Deposit, whether directly or indirectly, are said theologically to be "in materiâ fidei et morum." See p. 294 of our present number.

It should not indeed be forgotten, that in many cases there is in practice far greater danger to the Faith from errors which are but indirectly connected with the Deposit, than from any others. "For those books which contain an openly false and evil doctrine deceive only those who wish to be deceived, or else perhaps those entirely ignorant; but those which bear with them a *hidden poison* deceive even the more wary. Whence it not unfrequently happens that they are more pernicious and spread their venom more widely, than those books which are such, that their undisguised corruption deters all men from their perusal who are not indifferent to their own salvation." \*

A correspondent however of the *Westminster Gazette*, who signs himself "Sacerdos," considers that we speak too peremptorily on this matter. He complains that we "consider a Catholic guilty of mortal sin, who will not admit" that "the Church possesses infallibility in matters really outside the Deposit virtual or actual." Now in this we must carefully distinguish the question of things from the question of words. We have not indeed in this article spoken as yet concerning mortal sin; though we shall do so before we conclude: but here we will assume that every one materially or formally commits mortal sin, who does not receive as infallible the Church's minor doctrinal judgments. "Sacerdos" quotes no passage in which we have said more than this, nor did we ever intend to say any more; and the rest seems to us a mere

---

\* Charlas, cited by Dr. Murray, d. 17, n. 53. The following passage from Bouvier is worth quoting:—"Propositions, which *neither directly nor indirectly* appertain to Faith, as [purely] mathematical, physical, or political, cannot be subject to the Church's censures. On the contrary, all propositions which have any *affinity* with the Faith, *whether speculatively or practically, whether directly or indirectly*, can be judged by the Church's magisterium and (if need be) branded with censure. For this follows from the circumstance, that this magisterium is bound to preserve the Deposit entire and untouched, to deliver it unspotted as an object of faith to believers, and to protect it from all danger of adulteration" (vol. i., p. 408 of edition Paris, 1865).

question of words. Certainly the case never occurred to us of any one so extending the phrase "virtual Deposit," as to include under it such judgments as those above quoted, concerning Jansenius's propositions, concerning scholasticism, concerning universities and studies. But if any Catholic *does* use the term in this wide sense, the question (as we have said) is then purely one of words; though we certainly regret such an use of words as inexpedient, and as calculated to engender confusion.

Meanwhile an important distinction has been very acutely drawn by "Q." in the *Westminster Gazette*—a distinction by no means of words, but of real moment,—between the "object-matter" and the "organ" of infallibility. It is easily imaginable, e. g., that a person might agree with us on the former head, while very widely differing on the latter. He might fully admit that the Church's infallibility extends to truths, which are but indirectly connected with the Deposit: while yet he might add that the Church does not speak infallibly, unless her utterance possess certain *characteristics*; and that such characteristics are never found in Encyclicals nor always in minor censures. That F. Ryder and we are altogether at variance on the "organ" of infallibility, is manifest on the surface; but the question has been seriously raised, whether such variance extends to the "object-matter" of that prerogative. Let us consider then what is F. Ryder's precise position, on *this* issue as distinct from the other

We may or may not have ourselves rightly understood theologians, in the restricted sense we affix to the term "virtually revealed": but there can be no possible doubt that *F. Ryder's* use of the term is the same as ours. For he considers (p. 36) that no proposition is virtually revealed, unless "the process be *indubitably certain*," on grounds of reason, which connects it with immediately-revealed dogmata. By the term "Deposit" then, he undoubtedly understands what we have called the "actual and virtual Deposit"; and in page 27 he lays down, evidently as his own opinion, that the Church's infallibility is limited "to the enunciation, interpretation, and application of the Deposit." Then further, there is no one point on which he more urgently insists throughout, than on the strict correlativeness between infallibility and Divine faith. No doctrine, he considers, is infallibly taught, which we are not to accept by an act of *Divine faith*. Lastly, the very reason why F. Ryder denies infallibility to Encyclicals and minor censures is simply this, that the doctrines therein inculcated are so often external to the Deposit. This fact alone shows, that he

by no means uses the word "Deposit" in that very wide sense which some have assigned to it. We think on the whole therefore, not only that he differs from us concerning the "object-matter" no less than concerning the "organ" of infallibility, but that the latter difference is entirely *founded* on the former. We need hardly add however, that it would give us the greatest gratification, to find our difference from him less than we had supposed.

We conclude this part of our subject with a final remark. Our principal reason for the whole line of argument we are here pursuing, is to prepare the way for our claim of infallibility in behalf of Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters. It is important therefore to observe, that the acceptance of these latter will not at all enlarge the *object-matter* of infallibility; that there is no *class* of topics on which these latter utterances pronounce, to which a parallel cannot easily be found in the earlier doctrinal judgments. The instance always adduced in opposition to this statement, is the Pope's teaching on the necessity of his civil principedom. But in an earlier article (see p. 293) we have shown, how complete is the parallel *in kind* between this teaching on the one hand, and certain decrees of Constance and of Florence on the other. As to the mutual relations of Church and State—which is another frequent matter of instruction in Encyclicals and Allocutions,—read Luther's thirty-third condemned "error" in the "Exurge Domine"; and say whether any recent condemnation of religious liberty, as a *principle*, goes beyond the doctrine involved in that censure.

But far the most numerous of these modern decisions—and far the most important also, except those on the civil principedom,—have been on philosophical ground. Now it would follow, even from F. Ryder's principles, that there is a vast amount of philosophical truth within the sphere of infallibility. The doctrinal Deposit committed to the Church's keeping has the closest relation with philosophy; it possesses no one constituent, which may not be assailed on strictly philosophical grounds. A large portion indeed of Catholic dogma is in its own nature within the sphere of reason; though of course it is a very different question, how far unassisted reason would have advanced in its exploration. The Church's whole moral doctrine, for example, is so circumstanced, and her whole exposition of God's Attributes. But doctrine the most purely supernatural may easily come into contact with (erroneous) philosophy. Thus, the Church's teaching on Grace may be indefinitely corrupted and falsified by unsound psychology; nay, even such mysteries as the Trinity, the Incarnation, Transub-

stantiation, may be opposed by a chain of philosophical reasoning, purporting to show that they are intrinsically impossible. Now F. Ryder admits that the Church is infallible in condemning those errors, which tend *by necessary consequence* to a denial of revealed truth; and he must admit therefore, that all such philosophical errors as those above mentioned may be infallibly censured. Nor indeed can anything be more undeniable, than that the Church has acted on this principle from the first; that in dealing with the Manichæan, Pelagian, and other heresies, the Church pronounced as freely on philosophical errors as on those most purely theological. See on this head some remarks of F. Schrader quoted by us last April, p. 498; to which we will here add some further abridged extracts, from his great work "De Unitate Romanâ." (See vol. ii. p. 377-9.)

John XXI. then ordered inquiry to be instituted and report to be made to him, on the philosophy of one Bentus, an Averroist; and his bishop thereupon drew out a list of his errors concerning philosophy—concerning its object, truth, sources, foundations, and relation to theology. John XXII. condemned Echard's philosophical reasons for his theological error on the eternity of creation. Adrian V. and Leo X. put forth authoritative declarations on the union between soul and body. Clement VI., in condemning Nicholas of Ultricuria, laid down various truths on certitude. S. Pius V., in condemning Baius, taught the natural knowledge of good and evil possessed by mankind; the moral goodness of those acts which are directed by that knowledge; and other similar doctrines. So far F. Schrader; but there is no more signal instance of the peremptoriness with which the Church teaches philosophical truths, than that given by F. Knox. His whole remarks on the matter, however, are so very forcible, that our readers will thank us for reproducing the entire passage. The italics are our own.

Philosophy and the natural sciences rest entirely on natural truths, out of which they are evolved and built up by the processes of the reason. *Thus far the Church has nothing to do with them.* She neither supplies them with their fundamental premisses, nor superintends the mode of their evolution from these premisses. But the case is different with regard to *the conclusions at which science professes to have arrived.* The Church cannot remain indifferent to them. For through the unskilfulness of the philosopher, or the use of a false method of philosophizing, or the introduction of unsound premisses, the results of what pretends to be scientific research may easily prove to be in opposition to the truths of faith. But when viewed in relation to the Faith, *they cease to be purely secular in character.* The Church, as teacher, receives thereby jurisdiction over them, and it becomes *her right and duty,*

*for her children's sake, to declare them, if so be, erroneous.* She forms, however, this judgment concerning them, *not by working over again the process which the philosopher had gone through, and thus discovering where his error lay ; but by comparing his results with revealed truth, and estimating them accordingly.* Thus, *one who sees, corrects at a glance the faulty conclusions which a blind man has slowly and painfully arrived at by touch and hearing, regarding the shape and position of certain objects.* This he does, not by touch and hearing, but by another sense, sight ; of which the blind man is destitute. In like manner the Church, whose eyes are opened to the light of faith, is able by the aid of this superior light to declare infallibly that a philosophical system or proposition or book is unsound : and she has many times in the course of her history exercised this power, when her children's needs required it. As an early example of such condemnations we may instance the decree of Clement V., issued with the approbation of the Œcumenical Council of Vienne (1311) ; by which the Pope “reprobates as erroneous and hostile to the truth of the Catholic Faith every doctrine which rashly asserts or represents as dubious, that *the substance of the rational or intellectual soul is not truly and of itself the form of the body.*” And the Decree goes on to define that “whoever thenceforth shall presume to assert, defend, or hold that the rational or intellectual soul is not of itself and essentially the form of the human body is to be regarded as a heretic ” (pp. 49–50).

Knowing these various testimonies, we have been not a little surprised at some remarks made by a correspondent of the *Tablet*, who signs himself “A Roman Doctor of Divinity.” This writer considers the Church unable to pronounce infallibly on such questions as that of Ontologism and Psychologism. Does he think then that these questions have no connection with revealed dogma? Or does he think that, on things which *have* such a connection, the Church is fallible? He adds the expression of amazement at our opinion, that “a vast mass of philosophical truth was taught by the condemnation of Hermes and Günther”; meaning apparently that he disbelieves the infallibility of those censures.\* We take for granted that this Roman doctor will at least attach very great weight to the Roman Pontiff's judgment on such a subject. We would entreat his careful attention therefore, to testimonies which we cited as long ago as January, 1865.

Take, for instance, we said, the following passage addressed by Pope Alexander VII. to the Rector of Louvain University :—

---

\* This writer thinks that “a few years back,” Dr. Ward did not consider “metaphysics, politics, &c.,” as in any sense “subject to the Church's infallibility.” This is quite a mistake. The difference between Dr. Ward's present and earlier opinions is entirely on the “organ” of infallibility, not at all on its object-matter. Once he did not know that the Holy Father ever professed to teach *ex cathedrâ* by means of Encyclical or Allocution.

“ Unless *all the thoughts and devices* (cogitationes et consilia) of men, and specially of men of study (literis addictorum), *adhere immovably* in the case of *all Apostolical determinations without exception* (in omnibus omnino determinationibus Apostolicis) to the firmness of that rock on which the Lord hath built the foundations of the Church, it is quite incredible into how many and great follies and insanities the activity (curiositas) of man’s intellect is carried along a trackless way ; and that the more, in proportion to the excellence of its strength and perspicacity.”

So Pius IX., when repeating his condemnation of Günther, says :—

“ The original censure of that philosopher’s works by the Congregation of the Index, sanctioned as it was by our authority and *published by our command*, ought to have been amply sufficient, in order that the whole question should be regarded as having received its final decision (penitus dirempta censeretur) ; and that all who glory in the Catholic name should clearly and distinctly understand, that obedience was altogether due, and that the doctrine contained in Günther’s books *might not be esteemed sound* (sinceram haberi non posse).”

And at a later period he states, as a reductio ad absurdum of some proposition which he censures, that to uphold it would be to imply that his condemnation of Günther had been erroneous. Then again, so lately as December 19, 1861, in addressing the Archbishop of Malines on some philosophical controversies, connected with traditionalism, which had caused much excitement, he uses these words :—

“ Wherefore, expressing no opinion whatever on the merit of those doctrines which have excited the present controversy, and *of which the definitive examination and judgment belong absolutely (unice) to this Apostolic See*, we will and command that, *until this Holy See shall have thought fit to express a definitive judgment on this teaching*, both their favourers and their impugnors shall abstain from professing and defending any one of those *philosophical and theological doctrines*, as that which is *the one doctrine, the true doctrine*, the doctrine alone to be admitted and characteristic of the Catholic University (veluti unicum veram, et solam admittendam, ac veluti Catholicæ universitatis propriam).”

Here he undeniably implies, that whenever the Holy See should “ express a definitive judgment on this teaching,” the doctrine so determined will *rightly* be upholden, as that which is the one doctrine, the true doctrine, *the doctrine alone to be admitted*.

The strongest testimony, however, is yet to come. F. Knox (p. 52) quotes the following judgment of Pius IX. :—

All philosophers who wish to be sons of the Church, and philosophy itself likewise, are *bound in duty* never to say anything contrary to the Church’s teaching, and to *retract those things about which she may have admonished*



*them.* Moreover, We decree and declare that the opinion which teaches the contrary to this is *altogether erroneous* and *in the highest degree insulting* to the faith of the Church and her authority.

To this we may add, that the Roman Congregations have pronounced again and again on the very philosophies to which this writer refers; viz., the ontologistic and psychologistic. And this circumstance proves to demonstration, that in the Holy Father's judgment they are really connected with the Deposit. As to the theologians whom we quoted, he desires to see their text; we will add therefore a quotation from F. Schrader, who is certainly no mean authority.

What follows from the preceding facts? This, that *in the whole range of human sciences, there is hardly one which is not bound up within the Supreme Pastor's magisterium.* Bound up with the Church's Supreme Pastor and teacher of salvation is the whole of man—the whole of humanity [supernaturally] elevated. To humanity appertains the encyclopedia of sciences. This encyclopedia (so far as regards its connection with the Divine order), is moderated and tempered by his supreme magisterium; the Christian cultivator of science exercises himself therein with due regard to that connection, having to be taught and guided to life eternal by that Supreme Pastor; and therefore in the cultivation of sciences he permits himself nothing—*whether as regards their object and matter, or their method and form,*—which is opposed to the Supreme Pastor's express judgment, to his guidance, to his approval (nutibus).

The encyclopedia of sciences thus cultivated constitutes the Catholic university of sciences; and this was the idea, nay, the reality, of the ancient universities which once existed; and which therefore neither can nor ought to exist or even be thought of, *without the Roman Pontiff's magisterium and action* (p. 382).

Having now gone through our general range of subjects, we will proceed to contemplate the whole matter from a wider point of view. The infallibility possessed by the Church of this day comes down lineally from that possessed by the Church of the Apostles. When any man was converted by the Apostles, he believed, of course, in the *infallibility* of the then Church. But *in what respect* did he contemplate her as infallible? Was it chiefly—was it at all—in her *definitions of faith*? At all events not chiefly; at all events he *chiefly* contemplated her as infallible in her *magisterium*. For what is the ordinary and normal mode in which Christians were always to learn the Faith? F. Knox replies in his pamphlet with such singular force and clearness of language, that we are sure our readers will be grateful to us for giving them several extracts. We will only premise, that what he says con-

cerning the Church of every succeeding age, was pre-eminently verified in the Church of the Apostles.

The ordinary and regular mode by which the Church labours to imbue her children with the faith consists principally in a direct and personal action exerted upon them one by one. To effect this, she possesses in her clergy a numerous and organized band of teachers, through whom she is able to reach and come into contact with each individual member of her flock, and thus to learn and supply the spiritual wants of each. By this means none of her children are left without a pastor whose duty it is to know his sheep personally, to watch over their well-being, and to feed them individually with the pasture of Catholic doctrine. In every parish the Church has established schools for the young, and she fails not to superintend with unceasing care the teaching which is imparted in them. She provides for the ordinary education of her clergy in seminaries specially destined for that object, and while she has always encouraged her children to a deeper and more scientific pursuit of truth in the universities of which she was the foundress or the foster-mother, she has never ceased to superintend with jealous eye the studies pursued in them, and to banish from them every doctrine and method which was not in perfect harmony with revealed truth. But besides this direct action which the Church exercises upon the flock—her ritual and liturgy, the fasts and festivals as they recur, processions, images, shrines, special devotions public and private, the disciplinary laws which regulate her organization, her monastic and charitable institutions—these and a multitude of other things of like nature, conduce powerfully though indirectly to the same end, since they serve to bring home to the faithful and so to teach them the truths of faith which they embody, and on which they rest. They are in fact a kind of incarnation of the faith ; and when interpreted by the voice of the living teacher, produce a most powerful and abiding impression on those who live within their influence. *This method of imparting the faith to Christians, partly direct and partly indirect, is what is called in technical language the Church's ordinary magisterium.*

Next observe what follows.

But it may be asked what security have we that this vast body of teachers, none of whom are personally infallible, will transmit the faith to their disciples in its original purity, and not teach falsehood instead of truth ? How does the Church's infallibility come in here to guarantee their teaching from all error ? The security we seek lies in the position of entire dependence which the inferior clergy occupy towards the bishops in whose dioceses they live and teach. It is from his bishop that each one of them receives his mission to teach, according to the Apostle's words, "How shall they preach unless they are sent ?" (Rom. xv. 10.) It is under his bishop's eye that he teaches ; and it is to his bishop that he is responsible for all he teaches. No supervision could be imagined more effective and no subordination more complete. Thus the bishops are the guarantees of the orthodoxy of clergy's teaching. And with regard to the bishops themselves we

double security. First, in the principles of hierarchical subordination ; for as the clergy depend on the bishop, so the bishop depends on the Pope ; and as it is the bishop's right and duty to silence any of his clergy whose teaching is unsound, so it is the Pope's right and duty to impose silence upon a heretical bishop, and to take from him the portion of the flock which had been entrusted to him. Secondly, in the certainty which the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost gives us, that the *Ecclesia Docens*—i. e., the whole Episcopate in union with the Pope,—cannot err in the Faith, nor suffer even a temporary suspension of its teaching functions. What more effectual guarantee can be desired for the practical infallibility of the body of teachers through whose agency the Church imbues her children with the faith ?

A convert, then, from Judaism or heathenism to Christianity, by the very fact of his conversion, regarded the Apostles as his infallible guides to Heaven ; and regarded also the local superiors under whom he was placed, as trustworthy and unexceptionable witnesses to what the Apostles taught. What were the means given him by God for learning the dogmata of that religion, which he had happily embraced ? He obtained this important knowledge by repeated acts of intellectual captivity ; by humbly submitting his intellect to the doctrinal instruction given by the authorized superiors of his local Church ; by regulating his interior life according to the rules and counsels placed before him ; by uniting himself heartily with the spirit of that large practical and devotional system which surrounded him ; in one word, by unreservedly surrendering himself to the new moral and spiritual atmosphere which he had begun to breathe. And his security against being led astray by all this, was the gift of infallibility which the Apostles had received, and by the light of which they directed their various local societies. The Church's infallibility doubtless was his one prominent thought, whenever he reflected on the instruction he was receiving. But what infallibility ? The infallibility of her *magisterium*.

Now what is meant by a definition of faith ? It may be described, we suppose, with sufficient precision, if we say that it is a formula, prescribed by the Church's supreme authority, for the purpose of expressing with faultless accuracy some dogma taught by the Apostles ; a formula which Catholics are thenceforward to use, as the one authoritative expression of that dogma ; and by means of which, those intellectually competent to the task are to test the correctness and adequacy of their own dogmatic apprehension. Definitions of faith then, to say the least, did not occupy a very prominent place in the Apostles' history. In their time purity of dogma was assailed in various different ways ; and doubtless there

are various precise dogmatic expressions in the New Testament, which were introduced for the very purpose of repelling those assaults. Still we shall hardly find in their time what we now call definitions of faith.\* They once indeed held a solemn Council; but the formula which it issued was disciplinary and not dogmatic.† And assuredly when their disciples dwelt in mind on the Church's infallibility, it was on the infallibility of her *magisterium* and hardly in any sense of her *definitions*.‡

As it was with the Church of the Apostles, so also with the Church of the immediately succeeding period. A Catholic regarded the bishops, acting in union with the Holy See, as his infallible guides to Heaven;§ and he regarded the local superiors, under whom he was placed, as trustworthy and unexceptionable witnesses of what Pope and bishops taught. In this, as in the Apostolic age, he learned the dogmata of his religion more and more fully, by surrendering himself more and more unreservedly to the Church's elevating and supernaturalising influence. The infallibility which he mainly contemplated was not the infallibility of her definitions, for such hardly existed; but generally of her *magisterium*.

We are of course the very last to deny, that under the circumstances of a later period, a large increase in definitions of faith became not only most important, but even essential. Here, again, we shall avail ourselves of F. Knox's admirable exposition.

The first and ordinary way in which the Church seeks to expel pernicious doctrine from the fold, is by impressing more earnestly than usual upon her children in her every-day teaching the doctrines of the Faith which have been specially impugned. And the deeper the Faith is rooted in their hearts, and the more completely they are possessed and animated by its principles, the more easy is it for the Church thus to nip error in the bud, and to cast forth the poison before it has had time to do much injury to the flock. It was in

---

\* The Apostles' Creed—waiving all questions concerning its date—can hardly count as a "definition of faith." On the one hand, its wording differed considerably in different portions of the Church; on the other hand its aim was to give a general summary of dogma, not to express some particular dogma with accuracy and precision.

† See the remarks in our last number, pp. 19-21.

‡ If then, as some unsound Catholics singularly think, the Church's infallibility were confined to her definitions of faith, the Church of the Apostles, and of the immediately succeeding period, hardly possessed infallibility at all.

§ Some Catholics have a vague notion that the Church of the Apostles was infallible *in some different sense* from the Church of any subsequent period, because of Apostolic *inspiration*. We argued against this mistake last January (pp. 96-100).

this way that during the first three centuries of the Christian *Æra*, when persecution was incessantly winnowing out from among the faithful all half-hearted members, many heresies were withered up, and brought to an untimely end. And so, too, in the Middle Ages, when the whole framework of society was moulded upon the Faith, and in every department of speculation the truths of faith were regarded as absolute certainties to which all else must bend, erroneous doctrines were sometimes held in check for a long time, if not finally eradicated, by the mere force of the Church's daily teaching and personal influence.

But cases would occur from time to time, and must necessarily occur, which demanded stronger remedies and another method of procedure. Heresies arose so subtle in character, and so cunningly disguised under the garb of tolerated doctrine, as to perplex and divide for a time even the learned. Again, opinions out of harmony with the Church's teaching on subjects only distantly related to the Faith, would gain ground for a time in particular portions of the fold. And since the opposition of these opinions to the Faith was not evident at first sight, discussion and dispute would follow, calling for an authoritative decision to allay them. Or, again, a heresy would spread like a pestilence among the flock, and carry off thousands and tens of thousands from the faith. In these and similar cases the Church's ordinary mode of teaching would be inadequate to meet the evil. She must raise her voice and speak aloud to the whole body of the faithful, and *by a solemn and official pronouncement draw the line sharply between truth and falsehood*, and thus secure her children from the danger of unwitting error, and leave the rebels without excuse (pp. 59-61).

The Church then, ever guided and enlightened by the Holy Ghost, at a particular epoch of her history began putting forth numerous definitions of faith. So soon as this practice began widely to prevail, it became, from its very nature, a most important portion of her magisterium; and since all Catholics considered her infallible in her whole magisterium, they inclusively considered her infallible in this prominent and important part of it. The Apostles may or may not have explicitly instructed Christians on the Church's infallibility in definitions of faith. This point is *uncertain*; but another is *very certain*. To deny the infallibility of her definitions, would have been to deny the infallibility of her magisterium; and to deny the infallibility of her magisterium, would have been to deny one of the most vital and fundamental dogmata which the Apostles taught. To deny the infallibility of her magisterium, was beyond all possible question heretical from the first; and whenever she put forth definitions of faith, a denial of *their* infallibility became heretical also.

And here indeed we may see one possible reason of the undoubted fact, that the Church has never defined the infallibility of her definitions. So long as this remains the case, no

one can *limit* her infallibility to her definitions without the most preposterous blunder; because that very infallibility is itself undefined. So long as she refrains from defining it, she testifies most unmistakably her infallibility in things undefined. To proceed however with our argument; and we have now indeed arrived at the precise point, to which we solicit the particular attention of our readers.

Definitions of faith, as we have often said, condemn the contradictory tenet in each case as *heretical*. But, as time went still further on, the Church was guided by the Holy Ghost to put forth another class of definitive and irreformable judgments; she was led to put forth judgments, which in each case condemned the contradictory tenet, not as heretical, but as meriting some lower censure. This practice again, from the time when she began it, became a most important part of her magisterium. Hitherto she exercised her magisterium, in condemning this or that tenet as *heretical*; now she *also* exercises her magisterium, in condemning this or that tenet as *unsound*. He who denies her infallibility in this latter particular,—no less than he who denies her infallibility in the former,—denies the infallibility of her magisterium altogether; or, in other words, denies one of the most vital and fundamental dogmata which the Apostles taught.

It will be seen then, that for ourselves we cannot but follow Viva and S. Alphonsus, in considering it actually *heretical* to doubt the Church's infallibility in these minor censures. Dr. Reinerding, recently Theological Professor at S. Cuthbert's Ushaw, considers this (as we understand him) even the more common opinion of theologians; and it is evidently his own.\* At the same time it is most necessary to point out that the Church has never decided this, either expressly or by implication; and that a large number of theologians, while accounting such doubt mortally sinful (see *postea*), would brand it nevertheless with a less severe censure.

Of course our direct reason for knowing that these censures conduce importantly to the Church's attainment of her end, is the fact of her pronouncing them. But we have argued on a former occasion that, even *à priori*, you might have seen

---

\* "No Catholic theologian doubts that the Church is infallible in a minor doctrinal judgment (in *judicio dogmatico*). The only point as regards this infallibility which theologians discuss is this: whether such infallibility is certainly of faith or perhaps a mere theological conclusion; whether the proposition which denies it should be called "heretical," or "erroneous," or "close upon heresy." . . . The majority, however (*plurimi*), teach that this infallibility is of faith."—"Theologia Fundamentalis," part i., n. 408. "Q.," in the *Westminster Gazette*, first drew attention to this passage.



beforehand the absolute necessity of such a practice, as exercised up to a certain point. We should not have thought it worth while to reproduce this piece of reasoning—for at last the question is altogether subordinate—had not F. Ryder addressed an argument against it, on which he lays considerable stress. A correspondent of the *Westminster Gazette* thinks this reply one of the completest “*reductiones ad absurdum*” which were ever put forth; whereas for our own part, if we were to give it a logical name, we should rather call it an “*ignoratio elenchi*.” Let us begin then by quoting the original passage; which runs in the shape of a dialogue with some minimizing Catholic:—

Do you deny that the *Ecclesia Docens*, the Pope and Roman Catholic Episcopate, is endowed with infallibility, for the very purpose of faithfully maintaining that Deposit of Faith with which she was entrusted? “On the contrary, we admit it as a dogma of Faith.” Do you deny that there are various tenets, not theological only, but philosophical and in some sense secular, which lead by necessary result to actual heresy? “It is manifestly impossible to doubt this.” Nay, do you not deny that various tenets of the kind, even when not leading to heresy *by logical consequence*, yet are so intimately connected with heresy, that if they unhappily took root among Catholics heresy must be the inevitable result? “We do not see how this can be doubted, any more than the former.” If the *Ecclesia Docens* then had no power to expel these errors from the mind of believers, she would have no power to guard securely the Deposit of Faith? “Apparently not.” You admit then that she has power to expel these errors from the mind of believers? “We must necessarily admit it.” But she cannot expel them from the mind of believers, unless she can decide for certain in the first instance what tenets *are* thus erroneous and unsound? “That is but common sense.” Then she is *infallible*, not only in condemning tenets as heretical, but also in condemning them as theologically unsound? “On the contrary, this is that Ultramontane pretension which all intelligent Catholics so indignantly repudiate.” (January, 1867, p. 90.)

F. Ryder’s mode of replying to this is somewhat singular. He takes for granted (p. 53) that the passage is quite unconnected with the general subject of our article; and then from this most unintentional misconception he derives two controversial advantages: for (1) he rebukes us for introducing irrelevant matter; and (2) he entirely misapprehends the meaning of our argument. We said that “the *Ecclesia Docens* is endowed with infallibility for the purpose of faithfully maintaining the Deposit.” Now if by this we had merely meant that she is endowed with infallibility in the naked capacity of a defining-machine;—that she is endowed with infallibility

merely as regards furnishing intellectual Catholics with an accurate exposition of Apostolic dogmata;—F. Ryder's reply would have been very forcible: we think it would have been even conclusive. But then we meant something essentially different from this. If our antagonist had only read four more pages, he would have found (p. 95) what we meant by "maintaining the Deposit." The Church, we affirm, does not really maintain the Deposit, except so far as she imbues her children with a practical sense of the truths contained in the Deposit. Her Divinely-inspired means of doing this is, that she keeps what may be called her doctrinal atmosphere pure and unsullied; so that those who surrender themselves unreservedly to its influence, inhale (so to speak) those great verities, which that atmosphere holds in solution. And this being once understood—our argument was, that she could not possibly succeed in such an enterprise, unless she possessed the power of "expelling from the mind of believers," not heresies only, but errors of every kind which inevitably lead to heresy.\*

Now there has been some little controversy, though not on F. Ryder's part, as to the sense of this phrase "expel from the mind of believers." We wonder not a little that any one can have misunderstood it; but we have to thank Dr. Gillow for a very forcible exposition of its meaning. By infallibly condemning an error, the Church "expels it from the mind of believers;" because, after such condemnation, every Catholic either renounces the error or ceases to be a loyal "believer." Before the condemnation, such an error might be in the mind of many loyal Catholics; but after its condemnation, not one can harbour it.

To proceed. F. Ryder admits (p. 54) our "first three assertions:" he admits that there are certain secular tenets, which lead by necessary result to heresy; and that there are certain others so intimately connected with heresy that, if they took root among Catholics, heresy must inevitably result. We take for granted he will further admit, that, if such tenets became widely prevalent among priests and loyally-intentioned Catholics, the Church's doctrinal atmosphere would rapidly lose its purity: it might not indeed become actually *poisonous* till a somewhat later period; but it would at once become most unwholesome and corrupting. Consequently the Church would

---

\* We have nowhere implied that her infallible censures are in fact branded exclusively on those errors which would *inevitably* lead to heresy. (See p. 353 of this article.) But our argument in this particular passage was undoubtedly confined to such censures.

ipso facto cease to maintain the Deposit: because those who most unreservedly surrendered themselves to her influence, would not be forwarded, but on the contrary greatly hindered, in their apprehension of Gospel Truth. Or rather, in all probability, they would apprehend some counterfeit, and not the reality at all.

We may put in a slightly different shape what is substantially the same argument. One primary portion of the Church's office in maintaining the Deposit, is to protect (as theologians express it) the faith of believers. How can she possibly protect their faith, if she has no power to warn them infallibly when they are advancing rapidly on the way to lose it?—if she has no power to give them an infallible warning, till they are on the very verge of the precipice?

But take *this* proposition, argues F. Ryder (p. 54): "The Pope and many of the bishops are [from time to time] actuated by ambition and other unworthy motives." "Will you deny," he asks, "that *this* tenet leads in several cases, not logically indeed but practically, to schism and heresy?" Now if you take F. Ryder's language in its obvious sense, he counts this as a proposition which leads *inevitably* to heresy, if once it takes root in the Church. He cannot however really mean this; and if he do not mean it, then the proposition is not one of those to which our passage referred at all. We do indeed altogether—and in some sense indignantly—deny that any *true* proposition, rightly understood, can by possibility be such, that it will lead *inevitably* to heresy. We have been criticised, as speaking of "tenets" in our premiss and of "errors" in our conclusion. No. A tenet which "must *inevitably* result in heresy," is itself most assuredly an "error."

However we will meet the whole case frankly. We will at once concede readily—all the more readily indeed, because it is in fact no concession at all—that the Church would be greatly assisted in her task of maintaining the Deposit, if she were able to teach her children the proposition, that no Pope or bishop has ever been less than saintly. She cannot however teach them such a proposition, because it is not true. If any one indeed were to put forth a false and exaggerated statement on the evil motives of Popes and bishops, she would have full power, under the Holy Ghost's guidance, of infallibly condemning that statement; she might probably characterize it as "*Summis Pontificibus et Episcopis injuriosa*." Since however it is not true that all Popes—and very far from true that all bishops—have always been saintly, she has one means the less at her disposal to help her in maintaining Apostolic dogmata. There is the greater

reason then for her using more vigorously those helps which she *can* command; and which by themselves are abundantly sufficient for her purpose.

There is one other particular, on which we will now say all that is necessary, and so bring our article to a close: we mean our various references to "mortal sin" in the matter before us. One objection brought against us is, that our *doctrine* on this head is false; another, that our *expression* of it is uncharitable and imprudent. The two objections are obviously distinct, and must be distinctly considered; the first having an obvious claim to priority of treatment.

We have argued in our present article that doctrinal censures, solemnly uttered by the Pope and accepted by the Episcopate, are infallibly just. We have pointed out moreover, that there are various minor judgments put forth in an affirmative shape—as, e. g., at Trent, at Florence, at Constance—of which there is most abundant proof that they are taught by the *Ecclesia Docens*, and that the Church places them before Catholics as infallibly true. In a future article we shall further maintain that such judgments are by no means confined to the Pope confirming a Council or addressing the Church in Bulls and Briefs. On the contrary—as we shall argue in due course—there are many Encyclicals and other Apostolic letters, in regard to which there is most abundant proof that they were issued *ex cathedrâ*, and have been accepted by the Episcopate; and of which therefore all the doctrinal instructions are to be accepted by God's command as infallibly true. These various propositions we here assume: and we are to argue that he who will not subject his intellect to these various instructions,—who will not interiorly accept them as infallible truth,—materially, at least, commits mortal sin. Before giving theological reasons for this opinion, we will quote a few authoritative testimonies.

The Bull "Unigenitus" most assuredly contained no definition of faith; for though "heretical" is one of the censures therein named, there is no proposition to which that censure is particularly applied. The Bull then contains minor doctrinal judgments and no others.\* Those then who revolted against

---

\* These three at all events. (1) All the hundred and one propositions are untrue in Quesnel's sense (see p. 347 of this article); (2) there is not one of the censures pronounced which is not deserved by at least one of the propositions; (3) there is not one of the propositions which does not deserve or at least of the censures.

its authority, committed precisely the offence (neither more nor less) of refusing interior assent to the Church's minor judgments as to infallible truths. Clement XI., however, pronounced them "openly disobedient;" "notoriously contumacious and refractory;" no "true sons of the Roman Church;" excluded from communion with that Church: while Benedict XIII. added, that they had made shipwreck concerning the Faith. (See pp. 342-4 of this article.) Both Popes then declared that such men had committed, not mortal sin only, but mortal sin of a very heinous species.

Turn to the Encyclical "*Quantâ curâ.*" The Cardinal Vicar of Rome, addressing the Pope's own diocese under the Pope's own eye, declared that "he who listens not" to the Pope therein speaking has "no longer a right to the eternal inheritance of heaven": i. e., has committed mortal sin. The French bishops declare of the same Encyclical that "to contradict it would be the sacrifice of eternal salvation;" that it "binds every Christian conscience;" that to deny its infallibility is "to renounce our title as Catholics."\* Lastly in the Encyclical itself (as we argue in p. 284 of this number) Pius IX. himself teaches that Catholics commit mortal sin, who do not assent to the Pope's judgment even on matters which do not directly "touch the dogmata of faith and morals." Nay he further adds, that those who deny this are "audacious"; refuse to "endure sound doctrine"; and "grievously oppose the Catholic dogma" on Papal prerogatives.†

Here is certainly enough from *ecclesiastical* authority; let us proceed to theological. Observe first the following statement, copied from S. Alphonsus by Scavini with complete agreement.

Though the propositions condemned by Popes are not all heretical, but some temerarious, others scandalous, &c., yet when the Pope's definition is added, it is to be held, *as of faith*, that those propositions are truly temerarious, or worthy of that other censure (*aliâ inficiantur notâ*) which the Pope has pronounced. And therefore he would indeed be a heretic who should follow or defend them as true and lawful: yet he would *not* be a heretic if he were to separate propositions condemned in globo, and to contend that the note of heresy did not apply to this or that in particular; because in that case *he would not really censure the Church's judgment*, . . . since each single proposition has not been *condemned* as heretical. Still his

---

\* See Dr. Ward's letter to F. Ryder, pp. 25-6.

† See some further remarks at the end of the present article on this sentence of the "*Quantâ curâ.*"

condition would not on that account be the better [if he held that any one of the condemned propositions did not deserve its censure\*]; because he would still be rebellious against the Church and *guilty of mortal sin*.†

Similarly Bouvier:—

Objection X.—“When propositions are condemned in globo, very many of them do not deserve the note of *heresy*; therefore they may still be maintained.”

Answer.—“They may still be maintained”; i. e., “he who should maintain them separately *would not be formally a heretic*”—this I admit. “He would not be *rebellious against the Church*”—this I deny. For he who after such a condemnation were to separate the propositions and contend that the note of heresy did not apply to this or that in particular, and *were to defend this or that in consequence*, would not be formally a heretic, for he would not be opposed, strictly speaking, to the Catholic Faith. But his condition would not on that account be the better, since he would become a rebel against the Church and *guilty of mortal sin*.‡

In like manner Dr. Murray, whose work was most carefully examined and unreservedly approved by several very eminent theologians in Rome:—

*It is evident that all these sins, especially that of holding a condemned proposition, are grave (I suppose deliberation) as being in gravi materia, and implying grave rebellion against the Church's authority.*†

And when Cardinal de Noailles submitted to the Bull “Unigenitus,” “warned by his grey hairs” and by judgment to come,—what less did he imply, than that his disbelief had been mortally sinful?

We have to thank Dr. Gillow for drawing attention to the testimonies of S. Alphonsus and Scavini, and “T” for drawing attention to that from Bouvier. As Dr. Gillow afterwards pointed out, the latter controversialist quoted, as in his favour, Bouvier's exemption of him from *heresy*, without observing Bouvier's *ascription* to him of mortal sin, and of rebellion against the Church. No one has yet quoted the testimony of any one moral theologian on the other side, nor have we the least suspicion that any such is adducible.

Indeed we do not see how any theologian could possibly

\* This interpolation is necessary to make sense of the passage.

† Tract viii., n. 465. The quotation from S. Alphonsus is from l. 1, n. 104. The *latter* part is not to be found in any edition of S. Alphonsus which we have consulted; yet it seems necessary to complete the sentence, because the “quidem” implies the “tamen.”

‡ Edition of Paris, 1865, vol. iv. p. 409.

§ D. 17, n. 44.



arrive at a different conclusion. To fix our ideas, take any one minor judgment you please, in regard to which there is most abundant proof that it was issued by the Pope *ex cathedrâ*, and that the Episcopate has confirmed it. Now all Catholics admit, that every proposition so issued and so confirmed is infallibly true, and that God commands the whole *Ecclesia Credens* to accept it. Our supposition then comes to this : there is most abundant proof that a certain particular judgment belongs to a class, which God enjoins the *Ecclesia Credens* to accept as infallibly true. This being presupposed, there are three imaginable cases.

(1) The first may or may not be possible, but is certainly imaginable. A Catholic speculatively and explicitly admits that the judgment is infallible ; and that God commands every Catholic so to receive it : but he is so attached to the error therein condemned, that he does not choose to expel that error from his mind. No more words are needed. He formally commits mortal sin.

(2) Here however is a far more common case. Some Catholic loves the condemned error ; but he is ashamed of the intellectual inconsistency which would be involved, were he to cherish a tenet, while admitting that it has been infallibly condemned. He deals with himself therefore after a grossly dishonest and tricky fashion. There is most abundant proof before him that the pronouncement is authoritative, but he wilfully shuts his eyes to that proof. All this may very easily proceed in a gravely culpable degree ; and if it does, here of course mortal sin formally exists.

(3) But it is also very possible,—however abundant in itself the proof of such a pronouncement being authoritative,—that to this or that Catholic the proof is inaccessible. He may labour under serious ignorance of facts ; or he may have been taught false doctrine by guides whom he has great reason to respect ; or (without his own fault) his intellect may be naturally narrow and uncandid ; or his imagination may be most unreasonably, and yet inculpably, oppressed by the apparent difficulties which this or that minor judgment of the Church involves ; or he may feel an unreasonable, and yet inculpable, diffidence in his own power of judging on a question, which in some sense divides even pious Catholics. Various other alternatives are imaginable, any one of which would establish, that his ignorance on the obligation of assent is free from grave culpability. This is, of course, the most favourable case of Catholics, who refuse to accept the Church's teaching as infallible. What is to be said of such a man ? He may be most admirable and pious ; a model (if you will) of Christian

excellence. But he does that which, were it not for his invincible ignorance, would formally be mortal sin. There is but one theological expression for such an act: he "materially" commits mortal sin.

We do not see how any middle view is even imaginable. Take any doctrinal judgment you please, in regard to which there is in itself most abundant proof, that it was issued ex cathedrâ by the Pope, and confirmed by the Episcopate; and that God therefore commands all Catholics to accept it as infallible truth. He who refuses so to accept it, must, materially at least, commit mortal sin.

It has been asked, of what species is this sin. On this head we cannot do better than refer to Dr. Murray, d. 17, nn. 43, 44. We incline to think however, that what he says in n. 43 covers every possible case.

It does not however follow, we admit, because such is the undoubted truth, that we have acted either prudently or charitably in expressing that truth. "Especially in a Protestant country," says the objector, "all language ought carefully to be avoided, which can give our fellow countrymen the impression of Catholics being divided." Here again a twofold question occurs. Firstly, was it right under present circumstances to bring prominently forward the full Catholic doctrine on infallibility? Secondly, even if it were desirable, might it not have been done without the introduction of such harsh language, as this about mortal sin?

As to the first inquiry, we reply that, had we been called on (as we were not) to act on our own private judgment in the matter, we should not have seen how to act otherwise than we did. The tenet which we call minimism—the tenet which would deny the Church's infallibility in her minor doctrinal judgments—appears to us (under the circumstances of this age) to be among the most malignant of poisons. (See the remarks in our last number, pp. 154-5.) For ourselves, as we have already said, we cannot but follow Viva, S. Alphonsus, and the "plurimi theologi" mentioned by Dr. Reinerding, in accounting the minimistic tenet simply "heretical"; though the Church has not as yet affixed on it this particular censure. At all events it is our most firm conviction, that those educated Catholics who are imbued with it, and who are actively engaged in politico-religious or philosophical speculation, count in effect (however unintentionally) among the Church's deadliest enemies. We are not here arguing for this opinion: we have often done so before, and shall often do so again; but we are here assuming it. And since we did hold it, it was difficult to see any alternative, between either on t

one hand abandoning our humble labours in the Catholic cause, or else, on the other hand, expressing the said opinion and arguing in its behalf.

But it was an extremely great relief to us, that we were never obliged to take action in deference to our own private calculation of consequences. When first we broke silence on the subject, it was in July, 1864, in reference to the Munich Brief. The *Home and Foreign Review* had just been brought to a sudden end, avowedly in consequence of that Brief; its editor frankly avowing, both that his principles were vitally opposed to the Brief, and that he intended to retain them. We do not fancy that any considerable number of Catholics sympathized with the whole general tone of that Review; but we did and do think that its fundamental principle—the minimistic tenet—has a number of adherents, not altogether inconsiderable, among English educated Catholics. The circumstances with which we had to deal were these. The Holy Father solemnly proscribing certain principles as false and most dangerous; and a greater or less number of English Catholics adhering to those principles. It was no act then of private judgment—it was involved in the most ordinary duty to the Holy Father—that we who firmly believed his solemn judgment to be infallible, should earnestly press this doctrine on the attention of Catholics. We should have been disloyal poltroons had we shrunk from the task.

And if even the Munich Brief laid us under this obligation, what is to be said on the Encyclical and Syllabus which so speedily followed? How was it possible to hail that pronouncement with due gratulation, homage, and submission, without enlarging on its full authority?

The objector urges that this is a Protestant country. Here again to our own private judgment it is most clear, that the evil of temporary scandal to the Protestant, nay of a certain retardation (if so be) in the advance of individual conversions, is immeasurably small, when we compare it with that involved in deep and silently growing corruption of the Faith. But we had not to consult our private judgment at all. The Munich Brief itself was primarily addressed to Germans; and Germany is as far as England from being a Catholic country.

But now secondly, if we were to speak on the matter *at all*, it was necessary to say what we think, and not what we don't think. Here are two propositions. Proposition A. "It is a probable opinion, and one freely debateable among Catholics, that the Church is infallible in her minor doctrinal judgments." Proposition B. "The Church emphatically teaches the infalli-

bility of her minor judgments." These two propositions are as distinct from each other, as from the minimistic tenet itself. So far are we from holding Proposition A, that we have not a word to say in its defence; we know of no argument which proves the Church's *infallibility* in her minor judgments, except those which prove that she herself emphatically *teaches* that infallibility. It was Proposition B, then, and not Proposition A, which we consistently advocated from the first.

However, to a great extent we failed to make ourselves understood in this. F. Ryder implied at the end of his pamphlet, that we ourselves admitted the question to be an open one. And since his pamphlet came out, we have been severely rebuked in private for using, in behalf of what we admit to be a debateable opinion, language which (on such an hypothesis) would be doubtless intolerably violent and peremptory. It will be necessary then in future to lay still more stress than we have hitherto done, on the precise character of that doctrine which we advocate. Now to say again and again, that those who reject it commit materially (at least) mortal sin, is a practical way of impressing on every one our true meaning.

At the same time God knows how earnest is our desire, for more than one reason, of removing from this controversy every removable asperity. And if any one can devise some less invidious form of expression, which will nevertheless impress on our readers what we really intend to say, we will most gratefully accept his suggestion.

---

In p. 370 of our present number we cite from a very important sentence in the "*Quantâ curâ*"; and in a previous passage (p. 284) we speak at much greater length on the same sentence. Since the later passage has been in type and the earlier actually printed off, an elaborate criticism has appeared in the *Tablet* of September 13, assailing our view of the sentence in question. We are far from sorry that this criticism has appeared; because it will give us an opportunity of urging what seems to us a truth of considerable importance, on the due interpretation of such Pontifical declarations.

We must premise, however, one explanation. The *Tablet* writes, as though this sentence from the "*Quantâ curâ*" were the principal ecclesiastical authority which we had adduced

for our doctrine on infallibility.\* This is a complete mistake. The sentence is only mentioned once in Dr. Ward's whole volume; and then as an argument *ex abundanti*, for a conclusion already conclusively established.† In fact, though we are very confident that our interpretation of the sentence will be found alone tenable, yet we readily admit that this interpretation is not absolutely conspicuous on the surface. We would never adduce it therefore, and never *have* adduced it, as the sole or the principal argument for any conclusion, on which we desire to lay important stress. To avoid all questions about the translation, we will here print the sentence in the Latin.

“Atque silentio præterire non possumus eorum audaciam, qui sanam non sustinentes doctrinam contendunt ‘illis Apostolicæ Sedis judiciis et decretis, quorum objectum ad bonum generale Ecclesiæ ejusdemque jura ac disciplinam spectare declaratur, dummodò fidei morumque dogmata non attingat, posse assensum et obedientiam detrectari absque peccato, et absque ullâ catholicæ professionis jacturâ.’ Quod quidem quantoperè adversetur catholico dogmati plenæ potestatis Romano Pontifici ab ipso Christo Domino divinitus collatæ

\* “Dr. Ward believes himself to have proved, by this passage, that the Pope has declared, not only that he has this infallibility, but that those who will not ascribe it to him are guilty of audacity, and of refusing to endure sound doctrine. And ‘all this,’ says Dr. Ward, ‘has been accepted by the Catholic Episcopate.’ It must be acknowledged, therefore, that the passage is well worth investigating on its own account, and that Dr. Ward's success or failure in this particular undertaking must have a considerable influence upon the question, what amount of reliance is to be placed upon him as a safe guide throughout the whole inquiry into the subject of which his book treats. . . . We have undertaken to show that what Dr. Ward thought he had established ‘beyond the possibility of doubt’ was and is a mistake, and we think, subject to correction, that we have succeeded in showing it to be so. It has been a rather tiresome task; but our reasons for undertaking it were sufficient. In the first place we had been told, both by letter and by word of mouth [by whom?—Ed. D.R.] that this passage from the Encyclical, and Dr. Ward's arguments upon it, proved his case, and were unanswerable. . . . Although in the volume mentioned at the head of this article there are many arguments which appear to us quite as fallacious and unfounded as the one to which we have confined ourselves, there is *none on which he has laid greater stress* (!!) and none concerning which he has spoken with more triumphant confidence. No better example can be given of what we would call (if we would do so without offence) the carelessness and the reckless impetuosity of Dr. Ward's logic, &c. &c.”—*Tablet*.

† The “*Quantâ curâ*,” we said (April, 1865, p. 445), “gives us several further reasons for holding” what “surely no further reasons were needed” to establish. We then give five different reasons from the “*Quantâ curâ*,” of which this sentence furnishes only the first.

universalem pascendi, regendi, et gubernandi Ecclesiam, nemo est qui non clarè apertèque videat et intelligat."

Now, as a preliminary to our argument, there are various words in this sentence\* of which we must consider the meaning. And firstly "assensum." The *Tablet* considers us unfair in adding the adjective "interior" to this substantive.† How strange! Unless you suppose the Holy Father to enjoin mendacity, whenever he prescribes "exterior" assent, he must prescribe "interior" assent and something more. What can "exterior" assent mean, except the *expression* of assent? How can the mere non-statement of *dissent* be called "assensus"?

(2.) The word "judiciis." No one is said to pronounce "a judicium," or to act as a "judex," when he *commands* something; but when he authoritatively *affirms* something. Here therefore the word must signify declarations of something as true; *doctrinal* declarations.

(3.) The word "decretis" is not equally unmistakable; for "decrees" may be either doctrinal or disciplinary. If the word here had the *former* meaning, then the sentence would refer *exclusively* to the interior acceptance of doctrinal judgments. On such an hypothesis our own conclusion would at once follow against the *Tablet*, without the need of further argument. It seems to us however, we confess, far more probable, that the "decreta" here mentioned are *commands* issued by the Holy Father.

(4.) In the earlier part of the sentence mention is made of "doctrinal declarations" and "commands;" in the later part of "assent" and "obedience" as correlative to those declarations and commands. It is very plain then, that "assent" refers to the "declarations" and "obedience" to the "commands." The *Tablet* does not admit this:‡ but we must be permitted to think it so clear, that there is no

\* We may very suitably call it one sentence, notwithstanding the full stop at the word "jacturâ."

† "We pass by the introduction of the word '*interior*,' which Dr. Ward slides in here, although it is not found in the passage quoted from the Encyclical, and is not necessarily implied by the terms of the condemned proposition . . . We hold, on the other hand, that the word '*interior*' is introduced on Dr. Ward's own authority."—*Tablet*.

‡ The condemned proposition speaks of judgments and decrees to which assent and obedience may be refused; and Dr. Ward thinks that no one can read the sentence with candour without seeing that the judgments spoken of in the proposition are judgments which determine concerning truth and falsehood, and that the assent spoken of in the proposition has reference to them; while the decrees spoken of in the proposition are, he says, practical commands, and the obedience spoken of in the proposition has reference to



need, and in fact no possibility, of further argument on the subject.

(5.) The word "pascendi" here signifies "teaching." We argued for this conclusion in April 1865, and the *Tablet* admits it. We will so translate the word therefore throughout our argument.

Now as to the principles on which such a Pontifical declaration should be interpreted. In this matter it seems to us that Catholics have to be on their guard against two extremes. On the one hand, it is not to be permitted that any one should labour to invest Papal words with the widest possible significance, for the purpose of obtaining an apparent sanction to his own personal line of thought; yet neither, on the other hand, can it be right to aim at reducing their scope to a minimum. The question is not what the Holy Father's words *may be understood* to mean, but purely and simply what they *do* mean. Applying this general principle to the particular case of condemned propositions, it is held by all theologians that these are to be understood, not in every sense which they can legitimately bear; nor yet only, on the other hand, in any sense one pleases, which can be reconciled with their actual wording: but in that particular sense in which, as the context and circumstances may show, the Pope intended to condemn them. You have no right to load some condemned proposition with every exaggeration of which its wording is rigidly capable, in order to minimize the significance of its condemnation. We maintain that such a procedure is untheological, mischievous, and disrespectful to the Church. The work of a loyal Catholic is simply to examine the context and circumstances, in order to apprehend and accept the precise doctrinal teaching—neither more nor less—which the Holy Father intended to convey.

Now to apply these principles to the case before us. The *Tablet* in effect understands the Pope as condemning, not those who hold that "assent may be refused" to these Papal "judgments," but those only who unite two *different* opinions. Those only are condemned, in the *Tablet's* opinion,

---

them. But we can see no imaginable reason why both the assent and obedience spoken of should not have reference to both the judgments and decrees spoken of. A decretum, the object of which concerns the Church's general good and her rights and discipline, is a perfectly fit subject-matter for the exercise of assent as well as of obedience; and a judicium, the object of which concerns the Church's general good and her rights and discipline, is a perfectly fit subject-matter for the exercise of obedience as well as of assent."—*Tablet*.

who hold *both* that assent may be refused to the judgments, and obedience to the commands. Now we do not deny that this interpretation is compatible with the actual wording of the condemned proposition: but we do deny that it is compatible even with the *wording* of the sentence taken as a whole; and still more earnestly we deny, that it is consistent with the drift and context of the Encyclical.

Firstly then what is that instruction which, according to the *Tablet*, the Holy Father intended in this sentence of the “*Quantâ curâ*”? He did not intend, it seems, to instruct his children, that it is wrong to dissent from certain Pontifical judgments; nor yet that it is wrong to disobey certain Pontifical decrees: but only that it is wrong to *unite* dissent from the former with disobedience to the latter. Now we ask whether, even on the surface of things, this is an endurable interpretation of a solemn Pontifical utterance?

But when we look at the matter a little more closely, such a view becomes even more objectionable. There is no man whatever, holding that obedience may be refused to the commands, who does not *à fortiori* also hold that assent may be refused to the judgments. Those therefore who unite the two opinions mentioned by the Pope, are precisely those (neither more nor fewer) who hold *one* of the two in *particular*;—they are precisely those who hold that obedience is not due to the commands. Consequently, according to the *Tablet*, those very important and significant words which colour the whole sentence—“*judiciis*” “*assensum*” “*pascendi*”—are simply unmeaning and superfluous.\*

Or putting the same argument in a different shape. When

---

\* “It seems to us, with great deference to Dr. Ward, that the ‘circumstance’ does not add a feather’s weight to his argument, and has only afforded him an opportunity of making an extraordinary slip. The Pope’s words give Dr. Ward no warranty whatever for saying that the condemned proposition denies the Pope’s power of feeding the Church, i. e., of inculcating true doctrine on it. What the Pope says is, that the proposition is opposed to the dogma of the full power given to him by Christ of feeding, ruling, and guiding the Universal Church; but he does not say that it infringes upon all three functions of the power, and he does not specify the function of feeding as the particular function infringed on. It appears to us that Dr. Ward offers violence to the Pope’s words, by arbitrarily insisting that the Pope condemned the proposition as denying his power of inculcating true doctrine. Anybody has as good a right as Dr. Ward to say which of three powers it is that is considered by the Pope to be denied by the condemned proposition; and yet Dr. Ward’s argument breaks down if the proposition were condemned as denying, not the power of feeding, but either one or both of the powers of ruling and of guiding (*gubernandi*) the Universal Church.”—*Tablet*.

such phrases as these : “ *Apostolicæ Sedis judiciis assensus* ” ; “ *Romani Pontificis potestas pascendi Ecclesiam* ” ; are found in some doctrinal pronouncement, it is most certain that the Pope intends to convey some instruction, on the obligation or the excellence of assenting to something which the Pope teaches. But, according to the *Tablet*, the sentence contains no such instruction whatever. The above-named most significant expressions might be entirely omitted from the sentence, and its force would remain precisely the same.

The *Tablet's* interpretation then must indubitably be put out of court. But we contend further that the mere *wording* of the sentence, taken as a whole, actually necessitates the construction which we gave it. “ These misbelievers,” says Pius IX., “ do not endure sound doctrine.” He is indirectly then but emphatically inculcating on the Church a certain “ sound doctrine.” What is that doctrine? The last clause of the sentence explains most clearly. The “ sound doctrine ” is really included in “ the Catholic dogma of the full power given to the Roman Pontiff, of teaching, guiding, and governing the Universal Church.” These misbelievers consider that this power is restricted to those matters which “ touch,” as they express it,\* “ the dogmata of faith and morals.” No, pronounces Pius IX. : it extends over that whole sphere, which is concerned with the Church’s general good, her rights and her discipline. This is the “ sound doctrine ” which these misbelievers “ will not endure.” This is the “ sound doctrine ” which they contradict, when “ they contend that without sin, and without any sacrifice of the Catholic profession, assent and obedience may be refused, &c., &c.” We really cannot understand any reasonable doubt, that such is the one germane and unforced interpretation of the sentence.

We have entered at length on the question for two reasons. Firstly, we wish to take every suitable opportunity of protesting against these minimizing methods of interpretation. It seems a sort of mania with some, either to minimize the extent of infallibility, or (that failing) to minimize the significance of those utterances which *are* infallible : and against both these tendencies it behoves every loyal Catholic on all fit occasions to protest. Then secondly, Pius IX.’s sentence is really a very important one ; and as we have been challenged to reconsider our interpretation of it, it is more manly and straightforward to accept that challenge. But in conclusion we must again remind our readers, that we have never alleged this

---

\* See p. 285 of the present number.

sentence as the sole or the principal authority for any of our theses ; and that even if the *Tablet's* interpretation could possibly be sustained, the substantial evidence for those theses would none the less remain absolutely untouched.

---

## ART. V.—ENGLISH CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

*Christian Schools and Scholars ; or, Sketches of Education from the Christian Era to the Council of Trent.* In two vols. By the Author of "The Three Chancellors," "Knights of St. John," "History of England," &c. Longmans, Green, & Co.

*Special Report. Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education Bill.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed July 31, 1867.

**L**IFE is labour and a struggle with difficulties. Job calls it "a banishment ;" the Church, "a vale of tears." We are the "exules filii Hevæ ;" the Gospel declares that we are born "in tenebris et in umbra mortis ;" and the Royal Prophet cries out, "Educ de carcere, Domine, animam meam."

Ever since our mother stretched forth her hand to the fatal tree of knowledge, we have been in exile and degradation. Whether men call this world a banishment or a home, they all feel its penalties. We were expelled from the Garden of Eden ; lost the perfection of our nature ; were wounded in all our faculties ; stripped of original justice ; and left half dead, like the traveller who fell among robbers between Jerusalem and Jericho. Our wounds are—darkness of the intellect, or ignorance ; weakness in the will, and proclivity to evil ; a constant rebellion in the passions ; sickness and death.

Mankind, in the darkness and cold of his banishment, ever yearns after the clear light and happy bliss of Eden. He longs for the good things of which he has been stripped ; he labours and strives to regain them. He stretches out his weak and wearied arms towards them, and endeavours to climb the rugged steeps on the summit of which they are laid out.

These efforts we call education. It is the educating, the leading forth the powers of man from out their prison home, that is, from out of the penalties of sin, back again to the gates of Paradise. But at its threshold there stands an angel with a two-edged sword ; and none can enter whose garments are not sprinkled with the Blood of the Lamb. Christ is the

Light and the Guide; He alone bears on His shoulder the keys which the gates obey.

We all strive to recover ourselves; yet not all alike. The taste of that forbidden fruit has left a stronger thirst in the mind after knowledge than in the will after goodness, and consequently, the moment man abandons himself to the feeble instincts of his own unaided nature, he pursues knowledge as though it were the panacea for all his ills, while he permits his will to incline to evil, and accepts the rebellion of his passions as the due complement of his nature. He shelters himself under the plea of the *necessity of his constitution*, or of an inexorable *fate*, or of the *will of the Almighty*, as though to justify in his words that which his heart cannot approve.

Thus men have declared a divorce between the education of the intellect and of the will. The training of the one is eagerly followed up, while the other is left to the shifts and circumstances of chance. Examples of this are the great empires which have risen and have had their day, without recognizing God or His Christ as their Master and Lawgiver; such, for instance, were Babylon, Persia, Egypt, and China, and the great civilizations of Greece and Rome; such, in our own day, is England herself, so far as she patronizes and promotes the system of education called "mixed" or "godless."

But men have instituted more than a divorce; they have introduced the slavery of the parties divorced. For the mind of man is capable of a higher illumination than that of mere reason, and the will of a higher good than that which is purely natural. Now this higher illumination and this supernatural good were brought into the world by Him who came "*illuminare his qui in tenebris sedent*," and "*ad dirigendos pedes nostros in viam pacis*." He sits in the world, in the sanctuary of His Church, endowing His ministers with the power and the will to educate and illumine the intellect and to strengthen the feeble will.

The question, then, resolves itself into this: Is the training and cultivation of man to be confined to the *literæ humaniores*, to the natural arts and sciences, and to the practice of natural religion, according to the highest theory admitted by the Pagans? In other words, Is a man, born into the supernatural order, to be educated as though he were merely a denizen of the natural order, living upon the earth as in a home, not an exile? Is it lawful for any man, who has been redeemed and purchased by a thousand titles, and at a divine price—who has definite and personal relations with God, and the means of becoming intimately acquainted with a great body of

divine truth, to declare himself independent of these facts? and to deny that these supernatural truths are the food and the form of the intellect and will, or that they ought to be assimilated into his growth by the constant *study* and practice of them?

The answer to this elementary question is given in no doubtful accent. Dean Stanley, Mr. R. Lowe, M.P., Mr. J. S. Mill, M.P., Mr. Fawcett, M.P., Lord Amberley, M.P., Mr. Jowett, and Professor G. Smith, with the founders and abettors of the godless college system, and a thousand others in every rank of society in England; the directors of National Education in the United States of America; the philosophical school of Germany, and the positivist schools of France, unhesitatingly declare for the affirmative. More than this; the drift of English society is setting strongly in the same direction. In spite of the personal interest of 23,000 Anglican clergymen, and of some 40,000 dissenting ministers and preachers, Mr. Lowe's favourite measure for divorce between the education of the intellect and the will—between education and religion—receives every year a growing support. We are drifting back to the Paganism of Rome and Greece; but ours is a tenfold prevarication, for the light of the Synagogue never shone over Greece and Rome, but the light of Christ in His Church has shone over England and Europe. Alas for the feeble hold of the sectarian ministers on the minds and wills of their people! Alas for our country that, in the pride of their intellect men should preach a crusade against "the light," and advocate a return to mere natural and pagan education!

The tendency to make our national schools purely secular, and the intention to abolish religious tests from the national universities, have one common source and one direction; and both are pagan. The pride of intellect and the power of the world are darkness; and *Lux in tenebris lucet, et tenebræ Eam non comprehenderunt.*

The Catholic Church, on the other hand, has always taught the vital necessity of union between education and religion in every stage of life. She has consistently from the beginning claimed as her own the duty and authority to educate mankind. "Go forth and teach all nations;" "He that heareth you heareth me;" these are the words of her royal charter. And although she does not claim as a part of her divine mission to instruct man in letters and the natural sciences, she is willing to instruct him even in these. And if from some cause or other this instruction falls into the hands of others, she asserts all the more strongly her claim to be present with her "*auctoritate moderatrice, vi et influxu.*" She claims, in a word, to be our President during the whole work of our



education ; and this with a view to our good and the salvation of our souls.

It is upon this ground that we have to fight the battle of education in England ; and we are now summoned into the field by the opening to Catholics of the two national universities. Religion, we are told, is no longer to be a question of dispute ; it is to cease as an obstruction ; it is to interfere no more with our education. We enter upon a new phase of worldly wisdom.

We may lay down as our point of departure, and as an axiom, the truth contained in the following solemn words, which have been addressed by the Holy See to all the Bishops in Christendom upon the occasion of the approaching Council. They will serve as the recognized basis for all deliberations touching the work of education.

“It is exceedingly to be regretted that popular schools, which are open to the children of all classes of the people, and that public institutions, which are designed for higher instruction in letters and science, and for the education of youth, are in many places withdrawn from the moderating authority, power, and influence of the Church, and that they are absolutely subjected to the arbitrary decisions of the civil and political authority, and that everything is regulated and formed upon the personal pleasure of those in command, and upon the opinions in common vogue in the world.” \*

These sentences imply no new principle—no new practice ; they do but repeat in other words a system which has always

\* Vide “ *Quæstiones quæ ab Apostolica Sede Episcopis proponuntur*,” printed in the “ *Revue Catholique*,” and elsewhere.

There is a remarkable passage, already quoted in a previous article, from F. Schrader’s work, “ *De Unitate Romana*,” which is very much to our present purpose :—

“In the whole range of human sciences,” he says, “there is hardly one which is not bound up within the Supreme Pastor’s magisterium. The whole of man, mankind supernaturally elevated, is tied up with the Supreme Pastor and Teacher of salvation. To mankind belongs the encyclopædia of sciences. This encyclopædia, so far as connected with the divine order, is *moderated* and *tempered* by his supreme authority ; and the Christian student pursues his studies *bearing this connection in mind*, and knowing that he has to be taught and led to eternal life by this Sovereign Pastor. And so in the study of the sciences, he allows himself nothing—whether as regards their object and matter, or their method and form—which is opposed to the express judgment, guidance, or approval of the Supreme Pastor.

“The encyclopædia of sciences thus cultivated constitutes the Catholic university of science. And this was the idea, nay, the reality of the old universities of Europe. And they neither can nor ought to exist, or even be thought of, without the magisterium and action of the Roman Pontiff” (p. 382).

been held and practised since the day our Blessed Lord said, "Forbid not the little children to come unto me," and He took them into His arms; and surrounded Himself with holy women, and disciples, and apostles, who lived with Him, were taught by Him, and educated, calling Him in all things "Master," as He really was.

If any one wishes to follow the tradition of the Church, in the matter of education, up to its source, let him read through the two volumes which stand at the head of this article: "*Christian Schools and Scholars*." We gladly hail the publication of this work, as a messenger of special service; and we confidently recommend it to all readers who are interested in the office and mission of the Church to educate the lower and the higher classes, and the clergy.

It is not a deep philosophical inquiry into the history of Christian education, nor does it profess to exhaust the subject even from its own point of view. It modestly covers its first title with a second, "Sketches of Education from the Christian Era to the Council of Trent." In twenty-four chapters, or sketches, it brings out with much graphic power the constant presence and unflagging solicitude of the Church during 1,500 years in the cause of education. It proves that the Church has never allowed divorce between herself and the duty of education.

We could have wished, for the sake of those who desire to prosecute the research more deeply, that the writer had given, in foot-notes for instance, fuller references to her authorities and sources of information. And we ourselves should have been grateful for a fuller treatment of the contact and separation between Pagan and Christian schools in the first centuries. But this would have led to profounder disquisitions, and would have gone beyond the intention of the work. Perhaps the writer, therefore, under the circumstance that this is the first Catholic History of Education ever published in England, and that it must be written popularly in order to be widely read, could not have done better than keep consistently to the course which has been pursued.

The largeness of the subject which we have in hand scarcely allows us more than cursory notice; but we hope to return to these volumes again. In fact, the question of education cannot now be treated without reference to them.

We may mention that the writer of this work, which renders such timely service, is a woman, a nun, a sister of penance. We will even so far lift the veil as to recognize the head teacher of a truly excellent ladies' school for the higher classes, in the convent of S. Dominic, at Stone. The fact that we

are indebted for this work on education to a woman leads us on to another thought, upon which, without apology, we may rest and dwell awhile. It may appear to be a digression from our subject, which is university education for men: but it is not a digression in reality. For God has created the woman a help meet for man, and she has her part and her share in all his toil. If it was her hand that proffered to him the fatal apple of the tree of knowledge, is it not also she who, in the Second Eve, holds out towards him the Divine incarnate wisdom? It would seem as though woman, by her fidelity to the Person of the Word made flesh, during the years of His ignominy and pain, had secured to herself a peculiar light of knowledge or instinct with which to see and serve Him in after-time. He chose at His resurrection to manifest Himself first to her, and to make her the messenger of His presence, when others feared or disbelieved. He gave us His Mother to be the mother of us all, and made her our *Sedes sapientiæ*. And so, too, in the slippery path of man's education, throughout all time, woman stands, not indeed as his master, but as his angel to dash from his hand the forbidden fruit and to press his steps into the way of true wisdom towards God.

To explain our thought: how strong and how beautiful was the religious influence of mothers and sisters upon the education and lives of many of the learned Christians and fathers of the Church in early times! How much the Church is indebted to their devoted zeal and love! The education of Christian women in the primitive Church served as an antidote to the Pagan system, which prevailed around: the holy fathers busied themselves about it in a special manner. Read the letters of that terrible but tender-hearted old lion, S. Jerome. Writing in the middle of his deep studies, to a noble Roman matron, named Læta, he details with all the care of a mother how she is to instruct her infant daughter Paula:—

Procure little letters of box or ivory [he says] and let her learn their names, let her learn them by playing with them, and when she can put syllables together, and *spell*, give her little prizes, such as please such tender years. If she is slow and tardy do not scold her, but lead her rather by encouragements and praises.

Further on:—

When she is older [he says] teach her to esteem the Holy Scriptures in the place of gems and silks. Let her ever have in hand the *Opuscula* of Cyprian, the works of Hilary, and the letters of Athanasius. These will delight her, and the bloom of her faith will be preserved in them. Other sort of books let her read in order to exercise her judgment upon them rather than to follow their opinions.

Finally, he touchingly ends by saying :—

If you will send Paula to me, I promise to be her master and guardian, and, old man that I am, I shall feel prouder in forming her lisping words, and educating the handmaid and spouse of Christ, to whom the Kingdom of Heaven is offered, than ever was the great philosopher when made the Tutor of the king of Macedon, who died of the Babylonish poison."

The little child lived, and when grown up went to Bethelhem, where she closed the eyes of the aged Saint.

Time forbids extracts from other letters and writings, all exhibiting the same solicitude for the high standard of education for Christian women. Their influence, in turn, upon their age was proportionate to their education and piety. Thus there was S. Marcella, a widow, "the glory of the Roman ladies." She filled her palace on the Aventine with a number of holy women, Asella, Albina, Principia, Fabiola, and others; and, with the good pleasure of the Pope himself, S. Jerome used to go and give regular lectures to them on the Holy Scriptures; and priests and laymen considered it a privilege to be allowed to attend. Of Marcella S. Jerome said, that she had learnt all he knew, and in his absence from Rome she could answer all difficulties in Holy Scripture; but she spoke with such modesty as becomes a woman, and always seemed to be rather a learner than a teacher. S. Jerome says, "Her death filled me with such unspeakable sadness that for two years I have not been able to bring myself to write to you about her life."

Then again, it was S. Paula (another Paula) and her daughter, S. Eustochium, who encouraged S. Jerome through that gigantic work, the translation from the originals of the Holy Scriptures; if he flagged they kept him to it. They were his loving friends and penitents, and left Rome and their retinue and splendour to go and dwell near him in holy poverty and prayer at Bethlehem. It was they, too, who induced him to write his "Commentary;" he submitted his sheets to their correction, and dedicated nearly all his Biblical works to them or to S. Marcella by name. They sympathized with him under his persecutions, and strengthened and cheered him under all his heavy trials. And so it happened, that Paula, before she was carried by the Bishops of Palestine to her grave in Bethlehem, wrought by her influence with one of the greatest doctors of the Church a work of immortal merit and service to the Church.

So again it was Marcellina who persuaded her brother, S. Ambrose, to write the most beautiful of all his treatises. It

would be too long to do more than mention the names of Melania, the friend of S. Augustine, of S. Paulinus, of S. Jerome, and the penitent of S. Alypius, and Læta, Paulina, Principia, and Felicitas, Rufina, Albina, Salvina, and a host of others, many of them the noblest of the Roman patrician ladies, who, despising the world and cultivating their intellect, and forming their hearts on piety, wrought as feeble instruments great deeds in the Church and on society.

At Constantinople there was S. Olympias; she was what S. Marcella had been in Rome. She was of the highest birth, of great wealth and personal beauty; but S. John Chrysostom praises her "more for the neglected simplicity in her dress and in her shoes, and for her modest comportment, than for the rigid poverty and simplicity which she practised towards herself." She was to him all that S. Thecla had been to S. Paul. Seventeen of his letters are addressed to her; and her influence extended far into the Churches in the East.

But perhaps nothing is more touching or instructive, or more to our purpose, than the example of S. Macrina, the sister of S. Basil. Perceiving that her brother's education amid the Pagan schools had nurtured in him a root of pride and conceit, she so far prevailed with him by her sweet counsels, that he abandoned the schools altogether, to seek after the only true wisdom. Another brother, Gregory of Nyssa, had begun by leading rather a worldly life, and even after he had become a priest he took to teaching rhetoric in the Pagan schools, which, we are told, was "not only very dangerous for himself, but was a bad example to others, and a disgrace to his ecclesiastical state." It was his sister, S. Macrina, with another friend, who brought him round. He calls her his "director," and so she seems to have been with her heavenly wisdom and sister's love. He finally became a bishop and a saint.

The youngest of Macrina's brothers was named John. He was completely under her control from his childhood. She took good care that he did not frequent the Pagan schools, lest he might be injured by them, as his brothers had been. Her character and life were the model he passionately looked up to for the formation of his own. She inspired him with a wonderful love for sanctity, and educated him thoroughly in the sacred sciences. Rufinus says that he equalled S. Basil in his works of faith; and Theodoret declares, that though he had not studied in the schools like his brothers, he was as much as they among the greatest men of his time.

Such was the influence of this loving sister. She turned her three brothers into saints.

We cannot altogether omit allusion to the victorious faith and love of another well-known woman. She was a mother and a widow, and followed her son in the prime of his youth and intellect, from one infidel or heretical school to another, with tears and sighs and prayers. Oh, that he would live for God! Oh, that he would save his soul! Oh, that he would despise the world! The great Doctor of the Church of Milan averred that it was "impossible that the son of so many tears should perish:" her prayers were heard, and her son became, in effect, one of the greatest luminaries in the Church, the "Doctor of Divine Grace."

But to pass over all others, observe the true place of mothers and sisters in the university education of Old England. Mabel Rich did all that in her lay to promote the education of her son, and in due time sent him to the Catholic universities of Oxford and Paris. But so greatly did she fear and watch over the moral and intellectual dangers of these places for him, that in every parcel which with motherly care she sent him, she always thought to inclose a little discipline or a hair shirt, or some other instrument of penance for his use. Yet she was no extraordinary woman; but her ordinary Catholic instincts working upon the fruitful soil of her child's heart, so protected and nurtured him, that he outstripped all his fellows, and became S. Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Again, the two oldest colleges in the University of Oxford, if we except one which claims King Alfred as its founder, are indebted to women for their foundation. Lady Dervorgilla dedicated Balliol to the Holy Trinity, Our Lady, and S. Catherine, and provided its statutes; and Ella Longspée, Countess of Warwick, the intimate friend of S. Edmund, is reckoned as the co-foundress of Merton.

In a word, it is impossible to enter upon Christian education without the co-operation of mothers and sisters. They were more faithful to Christ in the Gospel than men; they are so still.\* Their special province, indeed, is the education and formation of the child; but their persuasion and influence, like a kind and gentle divine ministry, extend far beyond the years of childhood: they ought to accompany the child through his youth into manhood.

---

\* It is curious to observe the difference in the criminal statistics between men and women. Last year, 14,880 men were committed for trial, as against 3,939 women. F. Baker, O.S.B., says, "a very spiritual and experienced author did not doubt to pronounce that (according to his best judgment, which was grounded on more than only outward appearances) for one man near ten women went to Heaven." *Sancta Sophia*, treatise 1, sec. iii. ch. 1.



It would seem, then, that these remarks are hardly out of place when speaking on University Education. Our work and difficulties in England are to be solved by mothers and sisters as well as by fathers and sons; but they must be mothers and sisters "indeed"—of the true Christian stamp: not frivolous butterflies of the world, lured by its glare and entangled in its vanities;—such as these are always on the devil's side.

## I.

Every intelligent Catholic parent in the present day, as he looks out upon the world from the security of his own half-way journey through life, with a view to the prospects of his son, must inevitably be struck by some such consideration as the following:—How complete and thorough is the religious change which has taken place in English society during the past half-century. It has resulted, first from the internal dissolution of Protestantism, which has necessitated a toleration of religious opinion, such as had no existence before the rise of dissent; and, secondly, from the exigencies of increasing population and activity. A teeming commercial population locked up within our four seas, engenders its own laws of existence, and creates or modifies codes of intellectual and moral development, according to its own factions or necessities. Take the advance made in the mechanical appliances of the day: steam and railroad, electricity and the press, have brought the most active, the most practical, and at the same time one of the densest populations of Europe, into the closest commercial, social, and public relations. Every inch of ground is covered, every trade is full, every profession, every occupation is overstocked; the population in England alone increases at the rate of a quarter of a million a year.\* At the same time

---

\* According to the latest returns of the Registrar General, the population of the United Kingdom is 30,157,000; being an increase, in spite of emigration, of nearly eight millions within forty years. Within about half a century we have doubled in England the whole present population of Belgium. It is furthermore deserving of notice, as exhibiting to all classes the difficulty of the struggle for life in England, that there is a steady increase in the number of paupers. In England and Wales their number on the 1st of January, 1860, was 851,020; on the 1st of January, 1867, it was 958,824, showing an increase of pauperism within seven years of 107,804. There was an actual increase of over 900,000 paupers between July, 1866 and July, 1867; every division in the country showing an increase. The number of *convicted criminal offenders* in England and Wales has also increased during the last seven years. In 1860 they numbered 12,068; in 1866 they were 14,254; giving a progression of crime in six years of 2,186 criminals.

old social barriers are impatiently broken down, old privileges, monopolies, and rights are swept away; rigid conservative class principles melt, and are silently fused into a common and larger element; the population rises from below, a new soil is thrown up; and as nothing is weaker than water when parcelled into drops, nothing is stronger or more irresistible when combined in one direction and action. It breaks up, and through and over, and floods till it has found its highest level, changing the face of the earth. Even such is the rising of the intelligence and activity of the lower classes through English society. We shall presently allude again, to the social revolution which is thus created; we pause for a moment now to consider the *religious* effect which it generates.

This wheel-within-wheel system of commercial, professional, political, and social interests, which exists among us,—this intense eagerness and pursuit after life and wealth, directly tends to banish honest and consistent zeal for purely revealed truth. It would triturate all religious creeds into a pulp, which should interfere as little as possible with the friction of the machinery of this artificial life. It is an observation of Lord Shaftesbury, that the evil of the day is the *banishment of the positive doctrines of religion*.

Hence the parent wisely perceives that the whole bias of modern society is to dissolve the elements of all religions into one latitudinarian, universal system of natural religion. He perceives that many of the principles embodied and consecrated by modern society, upon which it feeds and grows, are condemned by the infallible voice of the Vicar of Christ; such as the dissolubility of marriage, the rights of superior strength, the doctrine of non-intervention, the sanction of accomplished facts, the denial of the existence of an infallible guide upon earth to heaven, and of the Presence and voice of the Holy Ghost in the world at this hour; the claim of goodness for all religions, of equal rights for error and truth, indifference to positive dogma, and the sufficiency of natural religion, and much more.

On the other hand, he perceives that society everywhere makes rapid strides in material civilization, luxury, Pagan and sensuous refinement, in the license of speculation, in sects and rationalism.

It is, therefore, plainly perceptible to him, as an intelligent Catholic, practically persuaded of the Divine mission of his Church, that, in virtue of his profession and creed, he is himself invested with a solemn responsibility. He has duties laid upon him which are co-terminate, not with his family and private concerns, but, according to his position, power, and

influence, with the whole national life and society to which he belongs. Society is sick and ailing; he is a member of society, and must look to its ailments. His Church has a mission to society, to teach and save it; as a member of that Church, he shares her Divine mission. Everywhere Catholics have their mission; but in the British Empire—and England is its seat—that mission is one no less grand and definite than it was under the equally wide-spread and dominant empire of Rome.

Meanwhile the world in England was never blander towards us than now. With a delicacy, subtilty, persuasiveness, and a determination till now unknown, it seeks us, asking, not for apostacy, but for a compromise. It welcomes us, it meets us, it invites us into its schools and universities, there to be moulded and formed, while yet young and pliant, without altogether renouncing the articles of our Creed.

Such recognized organs of the press as the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the *Spectator*, and *Saturday Review*—they are the pulses of the world—are courteous towards us while we are silent on the distinctive claims of the Church and the Pope; but touch these, and they at once are angry, or spiteful, or contemptuous. It is natural that it should be so; for the more latitudinarian men are, the more narrow, intolerant, and intolerable must we Catholics appear in their eyes. It is useless hoodwinking the fact: they seek compromise; and compromise is impossible, because truth is one: no transaction in religion between us and them is permissible. There is nothing for it but to stand firmly and bravely together, as a phalanx, like Israel marching through the world, bound and knit together in truth, under the infallible guidance of the Holy See.

The line of thought and appreciation here indicated as to the world's treatment of the dogmas of the Life of faith, may be pursued with equal force along the path of its code of morals. There is greater danger to Catholics from the world's principles than from her moral practice. Sins against faith are more mischievous than sins against morality, for the intellect is the eye and the light of the will and its guide; and, if this be obscured or put out, there is no end to misfortune; "abyss calleth upon abyss." Still, there are dangers and temptations here, enough to fill parents and their children with trembling, could they perceive, as those can whose work lies in the consciences of society, how perforated and honey-combed with immorality is this fair fabric of English society. There is a license in knowledge among the young, a freedom of use, of speech, of act, of companionship, a disregard of old restraints and protections, and an absence of respect, even in

the highest society, such as a few generations ago were unknown. The children have run ahead of their fathers and mothers. The finest "sets" may throw a rich veil over their moral state, and the lowest "sets" may whiten their sepulchres; but the corruption and pollution below, in both, are, alas! too visible to those whose "business is in the deep waters," and who have to distinguish and judge between leprosy and leprosy. But we pass on from these thoughts; the only security for a Catholic is a thorough Catholic education up to the highest point attainable.

These, then, are some of the reflections which must pass through the mind of every well-instructed parent, when he sets about finding for his son the more immediate preparation for his future in this turbulent and darksome sea called life.

On the other hand, as a practical man, which he needs must be, he is aware that, unless his son is called to be severed from the world on special service, as priests are, he must necessarily enter it and fight his way through it. Either he will have his fortune to carve and a future family to provide for, or else he will have public duties and responsibilities already waiting for him, riches to dispense and influence to wield. The Church is no stranger to these paths, which God has traced out for His children in the world. On the contrary, she has a blessing for all the fruits of the earth, and ever stands by the exile from Paradise, while he labours in the sweat of his brow, to console and to refresh, even to direct and strengthen him. While his head is bent towards the earth and he pays the penalty of sin by labour, she sings to him, in the music of her Divine voice, "*Sursum corda*,"—raise up your thoughts, your heart to Heaven, to God; journey upwards and homeward. This is her mission, and she has an infallible light to enable her to accomplish it. If need be, she has anathemas to launch and notes of reprobation with which to brand those who interfere with this her mission, or teach, under whatever specious guise of education or progress, that man should live for his exile and make this his home. And, because of this her mission, she watches more jealously over the question of the education of her youth than over any other mixed question whatever. It is with her a duty of vital import to allow of no separation between herself and her children during this, of all periods, the most critical for man.

As a man of the world, the parent sees at a glance that the most effective method of securing the success of his son in his career through life is to give him the very best education attainable; and, as a Catholic, he is aware that education and religion, like body and soul, must go together.

The time-honoured Universities of Oxford and Cambridge have been lately thrown open to Catholics, and Parliament and the country alike invite them to come and share its advantages. It is a strong temptation. Protestants have long enjoyed the benefits of University education; we know what sacrifices they are willing to make to attain it, and how the opportunities have all been theirs, while we, visited with a Julian persecution, had almost lost the aspiration after such a boon. But now we, too, are free and are invited. Can we *decline* the invitation?

There are two classes of Catholics who may be fascinated by the prospects of an Oxford education. It is impossible to encourage them to avail themselves of it: they *are* Catholics, and the Church forbids. But the legitimate aspirations, which happen to have turned their thoughts towards Oxford, deserve full consideration; more than this, there is an obligation to provide, if possible, for their realization. It is not out of place, then, to endeavour briefly to detail the reasons which are working upon these two classes of Catholics. We shall then see more clearly where we stand, as to the *necessity* of a University education. After that, we may consider the nature of that tree of which we are forbidden the fruit; and next what possibility there is of beginning a Catholic University.

First, then, there are the Catholic peers and landed proprietors and men of independent wealth—non-professional men. High education and careful intellectual training are no less instruments of power to the sons of these than they are to the man who carries his intellectual wares into the market, and is paid for them in money. Let us suppose the common case of the eldest sons of this class. The eldest son, frequently the younger son also, is to become a landed proprietor. Here then is to be a preparation for the exercise of a large important intellectual and moral influence over a numerous tenantry, beyond the mere granting of leases and receiving of rents, which can be done by anybody: there is to be an undefinable influence and authority to be acquired in the county, not only in elections and magistrates' meetings, and quarter sessions, and public gatherings, but in a thousand other ways and details, in which the public, with a rational docility, yields itself to the personal action of a superior intelligence when accompanied by a high sense of *duty*, and an honourable spirit of *self-sacrifice*. Men soon learn whom they can trust; and they choose for their leaders the men in whom they recognize the highest qualities. Then there are the more extended influence and power upon the whole empire, which may be exerted chiefly in the Houses of Parlia-

ment, in one of which Catholics have hereditary seats, and in the other the full right to acquire seats whether for England or Ireland. But golden opportunities are worthless as dross where there is no perception, no ability, no sense of sacrifice and duty to use them.

These are not days when the accidents of an ancestral name and a moderate income will carry much before them. The wealthy manufacturer, the successful merchant, the keen-eyed speculator, introduce a new element of social power, which they double in their sons by securing to them the benefits of a liberal education. The old hereditary squire, the baronet, or the peer, wrapped up in his ancient security, and consoling himself with his name and his pedigree, and supposing that the thoughts and family memories which exert so sweet a spell over himself and his domestic circle, must tell upon the world at large, is left far behind and forgotten.

No ; while neighbouring nations have fought their revolutions out on barricades, have confiscated property, expelled princes, destroyed aristocracies, stained their homes with blood and treason, we have been no more free than they from revolution, though of a different kind. It has been silent, quiet, unarmed, but steady and up-growing through the ranks of society. It has been the revolution sprung from hard-earned wealth, determined labour, and intellectual and moral power. Thoroughly well has this been understood and met by the ancestral houses of England. They have not been satisfied to bask in the sunshine of their woodland parks, nor to count up their broad acres, nor to trust to a name or a rent-roll. They have understood that, if they are to lead the country, if they are to have a part in determining the destinies of the nation, if they are to exercise a mission in the world, if they are to leave the trace of their life behind them, it must be by labour and self-sacrifice, and by cultivating their powers, as God has decreed, in the sweat of their brow.

In this respect, England has given a luminous example to the world. While the aristocracies of other countries have become drivelling, emasculate, and an easy prey to the upward growth and jealousies of the classes below, in England, through labour devoted and conscientious, and a high sense of public duty, they are still in the front of the nation, and the nation accepts their leadership.

It was Wellington's saying, "A strong sense of *duty* is the only safeguard for a public man." And in a memorable speech in the House of Lords, in noble words, he said, "I hope we shall never rest till we have found sufficient means for teaching the people of England their duty to their Maker,



and their *duty to one another founded on their duty to that Maker.*"

Lord Dalhousie, on going to India as Governor-General, wrote in August, 1847, "Believe me, noble as the appointment is, it involves sacrifices which nothing but a *strong sense of duty* and the feeling of *what God sent us into the world for*, would induce me to undertake."

Lord Canning, in going to fill the same office in 1855, wrote these words to a private friend: "There is no place like it for the means of usefulness which it puts into the power of one man. No such opportunity of leaving the mark of some good behind one, of doing something for the glory of God, can present itself twice in any life; and if rejected, it should be for reasons thoroughly self-satisfying and unquestionable, and in which no personal or selfish considerations should enter. But the wrench and uprooting, moral and physical, is awful, and I try not to think of it till the time comes. Feeling that my decision is the right one, you will, I hope, help me to follow out the course marked out for me, with a brave heart and a loyal spirit."

Lord Aberdeen, in 1854, expressed his high sense of *duty* in these words in a private letter: "If we are right; if we are acting from the highest motive; if we have no selfish object in view, and are actuated by a spirit of justice and moderation, as we shall stand clear before God, I cannot doubt that the country sooner or later will adopt our principles and opinions. If we act ever as in the presence of the Highest Tribunal we are safe, let what will happen."

A prayer was found in Peel's table, when he died, which he composed and always used: the tenor of it was asking for "a right judgment in all things," "perseverance in the course of duty," and "an entire spirit of self-abnegation."

We read in an article in *Fraser's Magazine* on Lord Herbert, a man of princely wealth, and heir to one of the oldest earldoms, that "he had formed so resolute a purpose to labour diligently throughout his public life, that an appointment whose duties were not much more than nominal had no attraction for him. He would take office *for work's sake*, or not at all. 'Had the situation I have accepted (so he wrote to his constituents) been one which required no exertion, no sacrifice on my part, I should unhesitatingly have declined it.' His career since then has proved that this was no decent profession made to veil the greed of a new gambler at the game of politics. It was the simple declaration of the principle which was to govern all his coming years."

We have given these extracts because they serve as

specimens of our meaning, when we speak of a sense of *self-sacrifice* and *public duty* being the only security to the aristocracy or the upper classes for obtaining and holding the lead in public matters in this country. A longer list of names would hardly add much to what we have indicated; yet, *ad abundantiam*, we may mention the names of Derby, Russell, Shaftesbury, Newcastle, Elgin, Clarendon, Panmure, Grey, Argyll; or, amongst younger and coming-on men, Stanley, Cranborne, Carnarvon, De Grey, Kimberley, Dufferin, and Hartington. To any one who knows how most of these have studied and laboured and toiled, like a clerk on his stool, like a merchant at his desk, neither too proud nor too indolent to spend themselves upon public duty—some of them very dragons of work, passing twelve hours a day in office,—it will be evident that mere title and wealth are not passwords to power and influence in England, nor the true instruments with which to accomplish work, or to serve even our own interests or those of our neighbour.

The provisions of the Reform Bill are a fresh stimulus to the higher classes to cultivate and exert their powers, intellectual and moral. The people, who are acquiring a dominant power in the country, are in the same measure losing the “bump of reverence” for pedigree and title; and they are jealous of the privileges of wealth. It was one of their own, and of a shrewd and practical race, who hit the mind of the masses when he sang—

A king can mak' a belted knight,  
A marquis, duke, an' a that;  
But an honest man's aboon his might,  
Gude faith, he canna fa' that:  
The rank is but the guinea stamp,  
The man's the gowd for a' that.

Intelligence, labour, self-sacrifice, love of the public cause, alone command their respect, and easily secure authority and pre-eminence among the people. Unless the higher classes bring forth these higher qualities, they will find themselves swamped by the growing masses of the middle class, of the mechanics, artisans, and labourers; for these have learnt to think, to combine, to “strike”; they feel their strength, and the representation of the country is now in great measure in their hands. The United States are a warning and a lesson to us; they warn us how strong and irrepressible may become the power of the people; they teach us that if the higher classes cannot retain the leadership through the force and weight of intellec-

tual and moral power, they will be dragged along the ruck by the demagogues and the masses, and lose both name and honour.

At the same time that these important considerations press themselves upon the mind of a father as he takes a broad view of the future duties and position of his son, he naturally falls back upon reflections on himself. He asks himself, how far have we Catholics of the United Kingdom recognized and entered into the public duties which belong to our State? We are twenty-six Peers, seventeen having seats; fifty Baronets, thirty-two Members of Parliament,\* some 200 independent landed proprietors in England alone; and what mark for good have any of us left upon our country? Some of us have been satisfied with our pedigrees and titles, our fine old trees and our fruitful acres; we have been content to live upon the reputation of our ancestors; we have feasted indolently upon the sweets which we could draw out of our position; we have sought an *otium cum dignitate* which we have not earned by labour. A life of public labour, sustained self-sacrifice to achieve great ends, with all the inconveniences and anxieties of responsibility,—these we have abandoned to others. We have soothed our consciences by occasionally attending a bench of magistrates, granting a summons or a license, sitting on a grand jury. But as to meeting the social dangers of the times by carefully getting up subjects, constant reading, deep study, writing and public speaking, cultivating our powers and exerting all our strength—this we have left undone. We have not yet sprung into our true position, nor struck out boldly into public life. Be the past as it may with regard to ourselves, this is certain, we must bring up our children to recognize and accept their position as a post of labour and high responsibility; they will have to account not only for their private acts and omissions, but for their omission also of public acts and duties. Under a despotic government the despot may alone be accountable to God for the general state of society. But in a country governed as ours is the responsibility will be charged not upon the Queen and her Ministers, but upon all men who, being born to a position, did not use it; who holding power or the means of acquiring it, did not wield it; because they cared not to use their heads and their brains, or to forego their pleasures and convenience. If the Catholics of the generation which is past held a responsible position, we hold one yet more responsible;

---

\* It is but just to say that several of our M.P.'s during the last thirty-five years have done themselves all credit, and proved what Catholics may do by devotedness, honesty, and public spirit.

and the generation to follow us will enter into moral responsibilities towards society and towards God far exceeding ours. For that which seemed only a tendency a little while ago in society to dissolve its religious elements, now is on the eve of active dissolution, or rather the process has already set in. The Catholic religion alone is "the salt of the earth;" and every Catholic is bound to scatter that "salt." And social, political, professional, intellectual, moral power are all of immense avail, where the mind and will have been thoroughly imbued with the truths and precepts which Christ teaches, *hic et nunc*, through His Vicar and Church on earth.

How shall we overcome the sluggish unwillingness in which we are immersed? How shall we vanquish the temptation to fritter away the prime of life in *doing nothing*? How shall we kindle a new flame in the bosom of our sons, and turn their life to the profit of their country and to the honour of their name?

We repeat it: in a country such as ours the Catholic nobility and gentry hold a double responsibility, arising out of their social position and out of their creed. Though we may forget it, there is One who will not forget.

Now, without passing any judgment as to the justness of these somewhat severe reflections of Paterfamilias, we hold it our duty to present the true apology for this old-world, shy, retiring character of our Catholic families as regards public life.

They have suffered long years of banishment for that faith which was more precious to them than gold or the favour of the world. They have been pariahs and outcasts from public life. After a man has been in prison or in shackles all his days, he scarcely knows how to use his new sense of liberty when set free. It is so with families. It is not forty years since the Catholic disabilities and penal laws were abolished. The moral effect of them, like an atmosphere, lingered in and about the old ancestral hall, impregnating, as it were, the saloons and passages, the study, even the very nurseries and all the curious old haunts. The father was shy, unversed in public life, and had no distinct precepts on this point to instil into the mind of his son; and so the son grew up like the father. But this excuse, we admit, is getting a little old; an atmosphere does not petrify and remain for ever: new currents sweep round and carry it away.

We believe, then, that the master-reason of our stagnation, as men of public service, is to be traced directly to our want of University education. We shall pursue this conviction presently, after we have rapidly surveyed the thoughts of the

professional man, who has to complete the education of his son, and is tempted by the real or fancied promises of Oxford.

It is a frequent and growing case. It is a parent who belongs to that intelligent and energetic class which is the nerve and sinew of our body politic; he exercises his honourable profession, and by dint of perseverance, honesty, and intelligence, he rises above the average. He has given his boy the best education he can find in one of our colleges. He has watched his growth with love and anxiety; he has planned many a scheme for his future success in life. Immersed as he is in his own profession, the business of life has assumed, perhaps, an inordinate importance in his eyes; this life has been more present to him than the future; he has never himself studied the philosophy of religion, nor keenly realized the vital value of Catholic doctrine and tradition; he had not himself been educated amid the influences of a national Protestant and rationalistic University; the questions discussed in his youth were not the questions of to-day. He takes a rapid survey of his own experience; he only half knows himself, because he only half sees the standard he might have attained; he calculates for his son the value of knowledge, education, prestige, and connection; he has heard Oxford men talk much about Oxford. He has understood it to be a password to success; he knows University education, with its friction and attrition of mind, to be good. Oxford and Cambridge—the two great seminaries of the Protestant clergy—split, divided, and tormented with doubt, heresy, and rationalism, have opened their gates to a flood; the antiquated test of the Thirty-nine Articles is laid on a shelf; Jews, Quakers, Wesleyans, Dissenters, Rationalists, and Catholics are all invited to enter, and are made welcome. Filled with parental love and interest, and dwelling overmuch upon the worldly prospects of his son, he determines to accept the invitation, and to send him to Oxford. The parents say to one another, “We have done the best that we could for him hitherto; we have built him up with every care; in two or three years more the ship will leave the dock and put to sea without us; let us spare no expense then now, let us spare nothing to complete the outfit for the doubtful voyage of life. Let us send him for three years to Oxford.”

Now, with each of the classes, that of the unprofessional and that of the professional man, whose claims to a University education we have thus briefly considered, we have a profound sympathy. Man is born to labour, whoever he may be: then teach him, and let him labour: God so wills it. Let him neither lead the life of a drone if he is in affluence, nor sink

among the dregs if he enters a profession. These are days for the Catholic to take his part in public life: the field is open to him: if he enters the race, why should he not win it?

But let it ever be borne in mind that we are sent into the world upon a more ennobling mission than a scheming policy after a name or earthly gain; and that the key to this mission, the guarantee to its success, and to our reward, is in our being Catholics, faithful as the needle to the pole, true as steel, tempered through and through in the genuine Catholic spirit.

We have just now attributed the backwardness of some of our Catholic nobility and gentry in entering into the public business of the country, and their marked inferiority in this respect to their Protestant neighbours, to a want of *immediate* education and preparation for it. The same holds good with regard to our professional men, though, of course, in a very much less degree.

Let us explain our meaning. The only educational establishments we possess in England are our colleges. In past years our system of education naturally accommodated itself to the circumstances of the time: during the long night of the penal laws we got what education we could, at home and abroad; and learnt "in our patience to endure:" when these became relaxed, we built up our colleges at home. Sedgeley first, then Old Hall, then Stonyhurst, then Ushaw.\* They were founded as schools. They admit boys as young as ten or eight; their ordinary course is seven or eight years; their system, for the most part, is directed and proportioned to boyhood. They were founded before the paths of public life in England were open to Catholics as now. They do not, therefore, lead a youth up to public life, and initiate him into it, as the national Universities do. When a boy has finished his college course, he is still a boy; he has associated with boys during seven or eight years, boyish as himself, and as heedless of the future. Contact with these will add nothing to him. Then, the rough and hardy life, the very inno-

---

\* Sedgeley Park was founded by Bishop Challoner in 1763. Old Hall Green *Academy* dates from 1769. In 1793, Nov. 16th, the Feast of S. Edmund, Bishop Douglas brought down to it the first arrival of Douai students: and Philosophy and Theology classes were forthwith opened under old Douai Professors. In 1794 those of the Douai Students, who belonged to the Northern District, left Old Hall for Crook Hall, Ushaw, where they opened their studies on the Feast of S. Teresa. Stonyhurst was given to the Society by Thos. Weld, of Lulworth; and Aug. 27th, 1794, F. Stone, the last Rector of the College at Liège, opened Stonyhurst as a college.



cence and seclusion of it (which have left him in a happy ignorance of crimes, in which his equals in the public schools are already versed) turn him out somewhat unpolished,—true diamond though he may be. In point of mere polish our colleges do not equal Eton or Harrow—a small drawback indeed, compared to the greater learning, and purity, and the friendship with God which they secure. And thus it happens that, by the time he has gathered in the facts and knowledge of school life, and has reached the time to meditate on them, to perfect himself, and to pass through a more immediate noviciate for his career in the open world, there is no generally recognized and defined system to take him up and perfect him, such as Protestants have.

Nor is this in any way surprising. Stripped and robbed of our public schools and Universities, as we have been—persecuted for 300 years, and thrust out—the only wonder is that within fifty years we should have been able to build up our primary schools and colleges. These colleges, moreover, are the best in the kingdom, in point not only of discipline and morality, but of instruction and general information, if we may judge from results in the Civil Service examinations, in the London University, and from the report of the Royal Commissioners on the Public Schools.

The reason, then, why we have been without a University for 300 years is self-evident; but it is not a little remarkable that, within forty years of their emancipation, Catholics should be already occupied with the thought of establishing one.

The limitation of our system to schoolboy life, which answered perfectly while Catholics were very few in number, while they still retained their hiding-places, and sought only to pass through life unmolested, is becoming year by year less possible. New aspirations, new wants, a new scope and view of life—in a word, the more practical realization of our position and the necessity of striking out vigorously into public life, begin to clamour and to demand imperatively the completion and perfection of our system; in other words, a Catholic University.

The Colleges have felt the want; and Stonyhurst and Ushaw, to instance only two, have made considerable efforts to supply it. At Stonyhurst there is comparatively a large class of young men, called “philosophers.” But it is evident that a University is not the work of a school or college, but must be the result of an aggregation or combination amongst many; and it is an act of the Holy See.

Parents who, in their anxiety for the advantages of their sons, when they have finished their college course, have sent

them to Oxford, have alleged as their excuse their perplexity to know what to do with them during the three or four critical years of life. They have said that to keep them at home in idleness is ruin to them; to send them abroad to travel for three or four years has great drawbacks; to put them into a profession is what they cannot do; and to prolong their boyhood in college is impossible. And then, feeling strongly all that we have described in a former page they ventured upon a step which the Church has now formally disapproved.

The appreciation of a higher education, the aspiration after it, the efforts to attain it, are not local or sectarian, but are common to the whole country and to our day. It has been said—and there is a truth in it—that boys are snapped up into business, and men must enter young into professions, so as not to give their equals an unfair start: but statistics prove that University education is on the increase too; and that intellectual cultivation, which is its produce, is in the market, and obtains its price. This pervading desire for education is like a gentle breeze at sea, springing up of an evening on a little fleet of sail, which has laid still the whole day. It catches first one craft and then another, filling this sail and then that, until all the canvas is spread and the whole fleet is borne along, down wind, in one direction, towards the port. It began with the century, in the famous Lancastrian discussions and efforts in behalf of popular education; it took hold of the half-deadened Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which were quickened by the application of the sharp knife of the Scottish utilitarian literati: then a “Committee of Privy Council on Education” was called into existence in the year 1838; then the whole of the Public School system received a new impulse from Dr. Arnold; finally, Royal Commissions were appointed to sit upon the Public Schools, and also upon the University of Oxford. And now these Universities are throwing off their religious character, and pretending to direct and educate the mind of the whole empire. But in the face of these pretensions, seven other Universities have been founded during this century, —Durham, London, Queen’s, Sydney, Toronto, Quebec, and the Catholic University in Dublin.

The Catholic community was carried along by the same wind; the industry which worked under the penal laws was quickened after 1829: the Poor School Committee combined with the Privy Council in 1847. Our colleges partook in the movement: they increased in number; their students multiplied; they affiliated themselves to the London University to obtain degrees, and they excel in the examinations. Now the clergy feel a want of purely ecclesiastical education, and

so the Bishop of Birmingham is founding his seminary; others will follow. The laity feel the want of University education, and some help themselves amiss; and we are all beginning to understand that something must be done, and that a Catholic University is the proper culmination of our system. It is in the wind: it is in the genius and character of the nation: within forty years Oxford and Cambridge have more than doubled the numbers on their books, and there has still been room for new Universities. When the tide sets in, it overflows all resistance; obstacles are carried up with it, or sink behind it in the flood.

It so happened, when the University of Paris was established, in the thirteenth century, certain Orders had set themselves against it (vol. ii. p. 8); they were wedded to their old system; it was full of pleasant memories and many blessings; it had been regulated by saints. But Stephen of Lexington, an Englishman, abbot of the Cistercians in France, saw the need of the times; and, feeling the want, founded a house, even for his own severe and contemplative Order, in Paris, in conjunction with the University. That which was begun by a few was followed by all. It was the necessity, it was the drift, it was the grace, of the time.

Now, the Church has never condemned the just aspirations of her children; she has always favoured knowledge and science. She preserved the literature even of the Pagans; she founded the civilization of Europe; and she has been foremost in every work of education. She has her divine instinct; she has her experience of eighteen centuries; she is practised, as no other, in the intellectual and moral dangers which beset mankind; she knows how to distinguish between the good and the evil fruit of knowledge; and she can declare unerringly that this or that system is fraught with evil to the soul, and that religion and education should walk hand in hand. With the true instincts of a mother she watches over the welfare of her children, and points out to them, in clear words of warning the systems which hold out a specious good, but are full of corruption and poison. Thus she has condemned both mixed education, and the fashionable divorce of the day between religion and education; as in the case of the "Godless" colleges. She says to her children, "Behold, I have a longer and more certain experience than you. I witnessed apostacies in Alexandria, in Cæsarea, in Athens, and Antioch; I know how men will risk their souls for one taste of knowledge, for one grain of fame. I have had experience of the University system, almost divorced from moral and religious discipline in France, in Italy, and in Britain. I have bewailed the

influence and the pride of the Universities of Germany, dedicated apparently to learning, but fountains of infidelity and sin. I have counted the apostacies in Trinity College, Dublin;\* the utter ruin of Catholic souls, some actually accepting emoluments as the price of divine faith,—and thousands silently, to themselves insensibly but surely, losing the bloom, the purity, the sensitiveness of Catholic faith, merging and compromising their religious profession as far as they dare, and daring more than they know. As a shepherd with his sheep, I forbid your entrance into poisonous pastures, but I lead you into pastures which are pure and healthful.” And thus the Church has condemned Oxford and Cambridge as seats of education for Catholics. She has condemned them upon her past experience, with her divine instinct, and after a due examination of the peculiar circumstances of the case.

The invitation, therefore, tendered to us by Parliament and the Universities to participate in their Protestant or mixed education, is declined by the Church; and her children, who are properly informed of her mind and discipline, have no longer the possibility of hesitation. The question was raised; it is decided and closed.

But our desire after a University education is none the less keen; nor is this desire thwarted by the Church, because she is obliged to forbid us the Protestant Universities; it is but turned into another and a safer channel.

We propose, therefore, briefly to consider two questions: the first, concerning the value to us as Catholics of the Oxford education, which we are compelled to forego; the second, the possibility of establishing a Catholic University of our own.

## II.

We fully admit that there are several natural advantages attaching to an education in the Protestant Universities of England, which Catholics are called upon to forego, for the sake of their faith and their eternal salvation. But we believe that many Catholics have very much exaggerated these benefits.

---

\* “It is a known fact, that of the Catholics who have studied at Trinity College, Dublin, few have escaped without more or less of injury, not only to piety, but to faith. And yet the Catholic student there has the advantage of living in one of the most energetically Catholic cities of the world, and of possessing in abundance all the means of his own sanctification and perseverance. Hundreds, it is said, could easily be counted up who have lost their faith in Trinity College—two of them a Dean and a Bishop in the Irish Establishment. . . A Catholic Bishop, who studied there, has been heard to say that his preservation from perdition amidst so many dangers, was as great a miracle as the preservation of Daniel in the lions’ den.”—P. 153, DUBLIN REVIEW, July, 1863.

Whether it be from the character of the mind which holds *omne ignotum pro magnifico*; or, whether they have judged of the benefits to be derived by a Catholic youth, from what they have seen or heard of the bright and perhaps rarer specimens of Oxford education, whom we have the happiness now to possess amongst us, we know not. If the latter be the cause, it must be remembered that the most prominent of these are exceptional men, and by no means a fair average type of what Oxford turns out every year in hundreds, who are never more heard of. But if the former be the cause, we hope in some measure to remove it, by introducing our readers to the testimony of Oxford men of position and ability, who have been put upon their evidence concerning the Oxford system. Our subject naturally falls under four heads: the social, the professional, the intellectual, and the religious. The subject is large; we can touch on each but briefly.

I. A strong feeling prevails among some persons, that a few years spent at Oxford would form an admirable introduction for their sons into the best society. This is a delusion, based on just a sufficient groundwork of evidence to render it specious and plausible.

For, in the first place, Oxford and Cambridge have both of them far more the character of major Seminaries for the Protestant clergy than of dominant aristocratic schools. The Alphabetical List of the clergy of the Church of England contains 23,000 names: and if you except an insignificant number ordained from St. Bees, Lampeter, S. Aidan's, Durham, and London, these are almost exclusively supplied by Oxford and Cambridge.

Secondly, of the twenty-four Colleges\* and Halls in Oxford, the Heads of all (except the Warden of Merton) are Protestant ministers.

Thirdly, the Professorial and Tutorial staff is chiefly in the hands of the Protestant clergy.

Fourthly, five-sevenths of the students† may be considered clerical students, or candidates for Protestant Orders.

And lastly, of "Tufts," as they are called, i. e., noblemen's sons, wearing a gold tassel, their number varies from, say, five to twenty in residence at one time; and as they enjoy the privilege of counting eight terms of residence instead of

\* Fourteen of the nineteen Colleges, and four of the five Halls, were founded by Catholics.

† Based upon a calculation made on the number of clergymen and laymen who have taken degrees in seven or eight Colleges. The fact, however, of a greater number of men for the world leaving before taking a degree than of the candidates for Orders, would somewhat modify the proportion given above.

twelve before they take their degree, social intercourse with them is in that proportion restricted and curtailed.

Now we quite understand the Protestant gentry of England wishing their sons to be educated in the society of their future clergymen. Such acquaintance and companionship may be very nice and profitable for them; but we can hardly understand the advantages accruing to our Catholic young men from such society: they do not intend, we presume, to cultivate closer relations with the Anglican clergy than their fathers did before them. And yet, as numbers show, the greater number of their companions at Oxford must be men who are to take Anglican Orders; and nearly all their superiors and masters are actually Protestant clergymen.

Dr. Döllinger will certainly not be accused of unfriendliness or of undue Catholic bias in his estimate of our Institutions. In speaking of our two great Universities he says, "They may best be described as a continuation of the public school in connection with a series of *clerical* colleges." \*

If, however, a man's high ambition be the cultivation of the fashionable society of his fellow mortals, we believe he will attain his end far more successfully by entering a regiment of the Guards, whose prestige and welcome in society is always certain, than by running into excess with a young Marquis at Oxford or Cambridge, or having the *entrée* to the supper-table of a Duke, or being the familiar and the "bottle-holder" of half a dozen other young "tufts."

We hesitate to print the words "toady" and "tufthunter;" but vile ideas get vile names. Truth is better told than concealed; and the fact is, many persons spare their friends in their presence, who can neither stay the current of their own reflections, nor silence the open criticism of others behind their backs.

But to proceed: of these companions, the fancied heralds and ushers into *good society*, let us hear what has been deposed in solemn evidence from Oxford.

"If the Oxford system wanted to present a pattern specimen of its defects . . . it would do so in the ordinary and recognized career of its noblemen and gentlemen commoners."—*Vide* "Oxford University Commission."—E. p. 56, Rev. D. Melville.

A gentleman commoner, says the Report, is well known to be marked out for every kind of imposition. He is usually courted by the worse among his equals; he receives his instructions, and is subjected to a less careful

---

\* *Vide* "Universities Past and Present." A lecture delivered in the University Hall at Munich, Dec. 22, 1866.



discipline. This class may be regarded, taken collectively, says Professor Daubeney (and his words are quoted by the Commissioners in their Report), as the worst educated portion of the undergraduates, and at the same time the one least inclined for study. Its qualification is notoriously only that of wealth. The practice of taking gentlemen commoners has been discontinued in several colleges from a sense of its inexpediency.

The Royal Commissioners advised in their Report, "that all distinction between noblemen, gentlemen commoners, and commoners should be discontinued." The advice has not been adopted.

Dr. Liddel in his evidence before Mr. Ewart's Select Committee, on being asked whether the sons of noblemen and country gentlemen are more or less numerous at Oxford than formerly, replied,—“I think they are rather fewer.”

Were we here to consider the unaffected simplicity and kindly consideration for others which form the charm of the English gentleman, we could by no means say that these are the exclusive inheritance of Oxford and Cambridge. A few months ago one of our leading journals published some articles upon the characteristics of the young men of the present day. We were told of their “uppishness,” conceit, and arrogance, joined to superficial knowledge and slender attainments. The Rev. M. Pattison speaks of the “conceit of knowledge where knowledge is not,” and says—

The experience of every Oxford tutor must bear witness to the great amount of tumid verbiage, of metaphysical and philological terms current among students in their third year, who are quite untrained in power of reasoning, of distinct thought, and of correct knowledge of language.

We are speaking here, however, of mental foppery and conceit only as they are odious in the character of a gentleman. The intellectual gentlemen Pharisees of our day, the chief tenet of whose creed is contempt for the opinions of others, are a growing set from Oxford. Very different from the men of other days! They are the groundwork of superficial unbelief, and the destruction of the principles of “respect and authority,” which are called by the Bishop of Orleans the bases of true education.

II. Oxford is considered by some persons to be a good preparation for the learned professions and public life. And no doubt a liberal education is becoming every year more essential for success. But it is also sometimes popularly imagined that a young man, by taking his degree at Oxford, thereby pretty nearly insures success in after-life. There could not be a

more egregious mistake. If he take high honours at Oxford, he has, no doubt, a fair chance of success in whatever he may take up as his occupation for life. But this happens, not because he carried off honours at Oxford, but because he has superior abilities, has improved them by careful cultivation, and turned them to account.

Formerly, indeed, a degree from Oxford or Cambridge carried a value which it does not now. It was a kind of pass to a man, it got him privileges, and protection, and interest. It was often a *sine quâ non* to his admission into certain offices, as we shall see presently, and it served him a thousand little turns. But the time of protection, and favour, and monopoly has passed away; and we are in the age of merit, competition, and competitive examinations. Men must now look, not to their degree and to the name of their school, but to their brains, to their perseverance, to the strength and honesty of their will.

We have now to examine how Oxford stands in regard to the public life of the country. The numbers on the books of Oxford and Cambridge have nearly doubled during the last forty years. In 1826 they stood, for Oxford 4,923, and for Cambridge 4,866; at present they are, for Oxford 7,300, and for Cambridge 8,925. So that it will be seen that the numerical strength of the two Universities has immensely increased during the last forty years: it is now over 16,000, as against 9,700 in the year 1826.

One would suppose, therefore, that the members of these Universities, if they contain all those excellences which are so loudly proclaimed for them, would be found practically monopolizing the greater number of desirable places and posts of honour in the country. And yet what is the truth? Their numbers have nearly doubled, and yet proportionately they occupy fewer places of honour in the country now than they did forty years ago. In spite of the increased exertions of Oxford and Cambridge to get possession of the mind and education of the country: in spite of affiliating to themselves schools all over England; sending forth boards of delegates to examine;\* in spite of their immense wealth and increased numbers, it would appear that these time-honoured Universities are falling behind the nation instead of keeping in the advance of it. Such is the progression of other seats

---

\* By a grace of the University of Cambridge Senate, in 1865, these local examinations are extended to young ladies.

of learning, and of the population, will, and intelligence of the country.

Let us come to further figures and facts.

1. As to political life. At present out of 556 lay Peers, not 50 English Peers are represented as having graduated at Oxford; and not 12 of the total number of Scotch and Irish Peers.\* Forty years ago the number was smaller, there having been at that time little over 55 Peers on the Oxford books, of whom not half were graduates.

In the present House of Commons there are 658 members; and of these also not 50 are set down as graduates of Oxford.† In the House of Commons, forty years ago, there appear to have been a smaller number of Oxford men by only about fifteen, according to a reckoning made from a collation of the M.P.'s of that time with the University list of the same date.‡ The ratio of the influence of Oxford in the Houses of Parliament has not therefore been according to the ratio of the increase of her own numbers. The real increase of the influence of Oxford has been in the ranks of the Anglican clergy, not in political life.

As to great statesmen, it would appear that Oxford has lost her old cunning in rearing them. Lord Herbert, Mr. Gladstone, the Duke of Newcastle, Mr. Cardwell, and a few others, left Oxford about the year 1832; but since that noble little swarm of statesmen, what other cast has the Oxford hive sent forth? The system seems to have changed; and to our liking not for the better. Facts seem to endorse the opinion printed in a note to the University evidence, that the present system compared with the former, "*breeds better tutors and schoolmasters, but not statesmen.*" We are inclined to think that it may be reasonably questioned, whether many of the more illustrious Oxford men, both in and out of Parliament, would not have become greater men had they never set foot within that University. We think it may be very fairly questioned,

\* *Vide* "The Peerage for 1867," by E. Walford, M.A., late Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford.

† *Vide* "The House of Commons for 1867," by E. Walford, M.A., &c. &c. A larger list no doubt might be made out, if we counted in men who have resided in Oxford, perhaps for a single term, as undergraduates, or have received, like Lord Derby and others, degrees later in life *honoris causa*, or by a *decree of Convocation*. But such as these can hardly be called the *fruit* of Oxford. The same calculation on the Legislature shows still less favourably for Cambridge, the numbers on whose books are, however, considerably larger than those of Oxford.

‡ We were not able by that process to ascertain who of these had graduated, and who had not.

whether many minds have not lost something of their native strength by a habit of subtle refinings and of nice distinctions, at the expense of the broad, simple habit of mind, which, though less scrupulous of detail, pursues its main course straight to the end, and is above all things consonant with the plain practical English character. Scholarship refines and adds grace to the mind, but it does not necessarily enlarge or strengthen it.

2. Till within a few years, the study of law at Oxford was entirely neglected ; or, at all events, nothing but the form of such a study was kept up, chiefly for the purpose of filling certain fellowships, which required a degree in Law. More attention, it is true, has been given to this department of late, but still it can boast of no high excellence, and has founded no school. Neither can Honours be taken in law, as in classics and mathematics.

The Oxford degrees possess no privilege which is not also shared by the degrees of the nine other Universities of the United Kingdom. Dr. Döllinger sums up the matter by expressing his opinion that, "the English Universities are not adapted for the training of public servants, nor are they intended to produce lawyers, or physicians, or men of science."

3. The other learned profession is that of medicine ; and the most celebrated institution of this profession is the "Royal College of Physicians," in London. Down to 1842 no physician was eligible to be a Fellow of this College, who had not taken his degree either at Oxford or Cambridge. But what do we find now ? Out of 229 Fellows, 90 only have taken an Oxford or Cambridge degree. And this proportion will continue to diminish, for out of 565 *members* of the College, 61 only, it appears, have come up from Oxford or Cambridge. Nor is it even whispered that the Royal College is less able or less skilled than formerly, when Oxford and Cambridge monopolized all its fellowships. It is merely recognized that, in medicine as in other things, Oxford and Cambridge men now take their proper place ; that is, the place earned by their merits, without let or interest.

Within the last few years, competitive examinations have taken the place of favour and patronage in the distribution of many of the valuable Civil Service appointments which belong to our empire in India and the United Kingdom. To labour and rise in the Civil Service is the profession and the ambition of a large class of men . A competency for life, sometimes even wealth, is thus secured, and the path is open to honourable and national distinction. We have been informed that some of the Anglican bishops have been heard to complain that

candidates for the Church in Oxford and Cambridge have preferred the civil to the ecclesiastical service ; and that the number of their clergy has diminished owing to their doubts in faith, and the advantages held out by competitive examinations. However this may be, Oxford and Cambridge have sent up larger numbers for examination than any other establishment. We have obtained the returns from one of the principal Civil Service Examination Offices, during the last ten years. We have carefully ascertained the number of examinations that have been certified, and the number that have failed ; and the result is that six-sevenths have failed from Oxford, and one-half only have failed from our Catholic colleges.

It is therefore probable that no Catholic, with a view to a competitive examination, will send his son to Oxford. It is plain that Oxford and Cambridge have no pre-eminence, derived from unrivalled success in public life.

In order, however, to illustrate the truth we have been maintaining, viz., that it is not necessary for Catholics to go to either of these two particular Universities in order to attain to eminence, either in politics, Parliament, law, medicine, literature, or science, we give the following list of well-known names, which we might largely add to. They may be considered, indeed, as representative men of the various avocations which they adorn, and none of them have been educated at either of the two Universities in question.

Duke of Wellington  
 Lord Campbell  
 Lord Chelmsford  
 Lord Russell  
 Lord Clarendon  
 Lord Brougham  
 Lord Truro  
 Lord St. Leonards  
 Lord Cowley  
 Duke of Somerset  
 Duke of Argyll  
 Benjamin Disraeli  
 Joseph Hume  
 Sir W. Scott  
 Richard Cobden

John Bright  
 John S. Mill  
 J. A. Roebuck  
 Thomas Carlyle  
 Leigh Hunt  
 Charles Lamb  
 Charles Dickens  
 Robert Browning  
 Sir Archibald Alison  
 Sir Benjamin Brodie  
 Professor Faraday  
 Robert Stephenson  
 Isambard Kingdom Brunel  
 Sir R. I. Murchison  
 Sir Edwin Landseer

III. Our next point is the intellectual instruction given at Oxford.

Without wishing to depreciate many excellences it may possess, we must guard ourselves against the impression that

Oxford can impart any knowledge or cultivation which we should be jealous of and pine for, as though it were a monopoly which we are debarred from touching. Our guide and authority on this head shall be chiefly the report and evidence of the Oxford University Commission, as the more friendly and the most impartial; and we shall omit every allusion to the severe and hostile strictures upon Oxford and Cambridge which have appeared from time to time in reviews and from other sources. We must also observe that several changes and improvements have been effected in consequence of the Report of the Commissioners, especially by the Act of Parliament in 1854; but we are assured that the changes introduced have not been such as to annul the force of the evidence we are about to bring forward.

It may be useful for the uninitiated to preface the following remarks by stating two facts:—

1st. A degree may be taken within a period of three years; but of these three years, a residence of twelve terms, that is of about thirty-four weeks, is all that is required by the University; and one of the privileges of birth is that the University obligation of residence is limited to a period of only thirty-two weeks. This, however, would not be a correct account of the residence practically required of Undergraduates. For the various Colleges insist on longer terms of residence than the University does. The practice, indeed, of the Colleges somewhat differs; but it is a fair statement, we believe, to say that a residence of about twenty-six weeks in the year is as much as is ordinarily required: many take their degrees without even so long a residence.

2nd. The cost of taking a degree, all things included, is £800 at least; to very many it is as much as £1,000.

Let us now hear something about the living instruments of education. The education at Oxford may be said to be given by the college tutors, rather than by the University professors. There are between thirty and forty professorships; several of them held by the same person. Some of the old professorships have received a larger endowment since the Act of Parliament in 1854; but still “many of them are so inadequately paid as to be practically useless to the University, from the impossibility of securing the entire services of eminent men.”

Dr. Döllinger touches off the professorial system at our Universities in these words:—

Six or seven lectures in the course of a year, framed to produce a pleasing effect upon a mixed audience, are held to constitute a satisfactory perform-



ance of a professor's duty. Instead of placing himself, like a German teacher, in the centre of his subject, and then marking out its circumference, and mastering it as a system, the English professor contents himself with taking a bird's-eye view, and so gliding lightly over his theme, throwing a casual ray of light upon isolated parts of it.

Even the erection, some years ago, of a few new chairs, especially for the teaching of history, has not succeeded in changing their traditional character in any essential particular. The German [and we might add the Roman] method, whereby a whole region of knowledge is traversed from end to end, in a series of daily lectures, delivered by the teacher and taken down by the pupil, has as yet no footing in them.

The late Dr. Arnold used to give a *complete course* of modern history at Oxford in *nine* (!) lectures during the year.

The tutors, upon whom education at the University really depends, are about seventy in number. They are usually chosen out of the Fellows; but the qualifications of a Fellow and an instructor are by no means identical.

Of tutors there are generally three or four in each college, who divide the work between them; sometimes making a division of the lectures to be given, sometimes of the pupils to be instructed. Instead, therefore, of receiving in each subject the instruction of one eminent man, who gives himself up entirely to that, the undergraduates have as many teachers in each subject as there are colleges, and each tutor has to undertake several subjects. Moreover, the Fellows, from whom the tutors are taken, cannot marry, and, in consequence most tutors are watching for some opening in another quarter. They are rapidly removed, and have not time to pursue their studies far.—“Evidence,” p. 128, by the Rev. Fred. Temple, DD., late Tutor of Balliol, and Head Master of Rugby.

As a general rule [says the Rev. John Wilkinson, M.A., of Merton] a man secures a home and marries as soon as he can get the means; an able man does this sooner than another, and is forthwith lost to Oxford. Thus the best, because the most experienced, tutors are being continually drafted off into the world, and the duties left to young men. This evil will increase, as the demand for highly-educated men increases at home and abroad, in the service of the Government and in professions. No tutor seems to regard his office as a profession, or its duties as an employment for life. Nor can a man be expected to live without a home; to this his tutorship not leading, he throws it up at the first prospect of something else, making, perhaps, a present sacrifice. . . . As he begins so he ends, without hope or fear; no services improve—no incapacity lessens his position or his pocket. It is unfair to expose human nature to this severance of duty and interest.—“Evidence,” p. 75.

I believe the colleges and halls, according to their present constitution, are wholly incapable of furnishing adequate instruction on the subjects now studied. . . . Practically we have *twenty* Universities instead of *one*.

The principle of division of labour is thus seriously violated ; and it is inconceivable that, giving the existing tutors credit for the most conscientious devotion to their duties, anything but the merest mediocrity of instruction in various branches of literature and science should be the result.—Rev. W. Hayward Cox, Vice-principal of St. Mary's Hall.—“Evidence,” p. 97.

Sir Charles Lyell's evidence is to the same effect :—

The unavoidable consequence [he says] of the present system, is that the Greek and Roman languages and writers are taught to grown-up men at college in the same style as to boys in the upper classes of our grammar schools. Indeed, the average college tutor is not equal in ability and scholarship to the average head-master of a great public school. Parents who have no personal experience of Oxford, and who hear that there are professorships there of modern history, English literature, several living languages, political economy, law, and medicine, astronomy, natural philosophy, chemistry, anatomy, and botany, are too apt to believe that all these things are really taught to those who wish to study them.—“Evidence,” p. 120.

We may sum up this evidence, with that of the Rev. Mark Pattison, M.A., now rector of Lincoln College :—

The causes of the disrepute of the College tutor may be easily enumerated :—

1. Chiefly individual inferiority, want of ability, defective attainments, indifference to his occupation, and other personal disqualifications.
2. Each tutor undertaking too many classes and too many pupils.
3. Each tutor having to teach too great a variety of subjects.
4. The admission of unprepared students, who lower the general tone of instruction.
5. The too great toleration of idle students.
6. The transitory nature of the occupation, which in most cases being adopted *in transitu* to a totally different pursuit, has none of the aids which in the regular professions are derived from regard to professional credit, and the sustained interest which a life-pursuit possesses.—“Evidence,” p. 48.

The Report of the Royal Commission stated that it considered the present state of instruction to be unsatisfactory.

The value of the Private Tutor system is sometimes much cried up. Let us add a remark upon this subject made by an advocate of the system, himself eminently qualified, from his own experience and from keen penetration, to speak on such a point with authority. It is Mr. Robert Lowe, M.P. :—

The persons into whose hands private tuition principally falls are young men of unformed character, knowing little of the world, or probably of anything except the course of study by which they have gained distinction. They have, nevertheless, very great influence over their pupils, and are from

their youth, their sincerity, and their earnestness, the most dangerous missionaries of whatever opinions they take up. They are the persons who are really forming the minds of the undergraduates before they have formed their own. The University knows nothing of them except their names in the class list : in their college they have no status, and it is quite optional with them whether they enter into the society there or not. Everything is entrusted to them, and no caution whatever is taken for the execution of the trust. As regards the private tutors themselves, I cannot but think it bad for them that the moment they have taken their degree, they should be considered at once elevated to the highest intellectual eminence, and spend their whole time in teaching that which they have but just and barely learnt. The tendency to narrow the mind and generate habits of self-conceit is obvious.

The Rev. David Melville's evidence in this respect corroborates that of Mr. R. Lowe. He says :—

The effects for ill (of the system of private tutors) are shared by the teacher, the taught and the academical system under which, to such an extent, the phenomenon is found. The teacher suffers morally often ; intellectually generally . . . . the *taught* suffers by having his idleness and inactivity consulted, and a sense of reliance on others generated, where especially the contrary would be advantageous. It is thus through the private rather than the public tuition that opinions get canvassed—views adopted and energy displayed : most of the attachment on one side and felt interest on the other is there, and so the result on the system is necessary ; either it is coloured by the narrow and defective character of those who, though unauthorized, are the efficient agents, or there is an evident want of relation and harmony between it and its active ministers.—“Evidence,” p. 56.

Abundant corroborative evidence might be alleged from persons who have passed through both systems, to show that the decided advantage in teaching lies with such colleges as Ushaw, Stonyhurst, and Oscott—to name only our three largest—over the colleges of the Protestant University. We have it from the mouths of Catholics who have gone to Oxford, and of Oxford men who have joined our colleges.

With regard to degrees, we are told that “University success is rather the reward of memory than of mind, and is more likely to be secured by fixing facts and doctrines firmly in the memory, than by drawing them from remote and subtle inferences or by establishing between them refined and logical distinctions” (R. Lowe, p. 13). Another authoritative witness deposes that “it is the business of the private tutor to pack into his pupil's memory the ready-made results of labour, to enable him to pass an examination as well as if he had worked out the subject or author for himself.” And another, a Fellow and a tutor, says, “the teaching has rather respect to

the examination than to the cultivation of the intellectual powers and the formation of character: a subject is not studied in a broad and comprehensive manner: and the student's energies are cramped." And the Report says "that it is well known that the greater part of the higher degrees are conferred on the performance of exercises which are merely nominal."

We conclude this point by the summing up of a leading London organ of the last evidence given by Dr. Liddell, Dean of Christ Church, before Mr. Ewart's Select Committee. The passage has been reproduced by other organs of the press:—

His evidence fully confirms the worst that any opponents of University monopolies have ever alleged as to the evil effects of the present system. Twenty-five years ago the abuses of the educational system at both one and the other University were disgraceful enough; but there is now the positive testimony of Dean Liddell, the head of the largest and most distinguished house at Oxford, to the effect that of late years education at his University has been degraded, and that it is even now in process of degeneration. One cannot regret this; it is only the result which was to be anticipated from the maintenance of a bad system, opposed to the ideas of the time, identified with the retrograde political notions of a decaying faction. One is not surprised that the best class of Oxford graduates, the most distinguished scholars whom the University has of late years produced, the "double-firsts" of her class lists, now decline to take an active part in the teaching and the practical conduct of the University, or to mix themselves up with a system which they rightly believe to be doomed. It will be so until some steps are taken to popularize these great foundations, to take them out of the hands of narrow sectarian cliques, to make them what they ought to be, the true intellectual centres of the nation.

We add the general verdict of Mr. John Stuart Mill, as expressed in his inaugural speech; a person certainly who has before him larger means of knowledge and experience than we have. He says, "Youths come to the Scottish Universities ignorant, and are there taught. The majority of those who come to the English Universities come still more ignorant, and ignorant they go away" (p. 10 of his Address, &c.).

IV. We now come to our fourth and last criticism upon the Oxford system for a Catholic. It is infinitely the most important, because it touches directly the mainspring of his eternal destiny. It is the *religious influence* of Oxford upon a youth from a Catholic college.

And we must preface what we have to say by an obvious consideration. Fish out of the salt water and fish out of the fresh cannot thrive together, or even live in the same tank. There is an essential difference in the taste and temperature of

Catholic and non-Catholic society in England. Youths out of these two classes cannot be gathered into the same reservoir to be intellectually and morally fed together, and then turned out each perfect in his way. The reservoir is fed from the salt or the fresh water; but if from both, the fresh water will lose its sweetness.

Now, we are not saying that Catholics are more learned, more intelligent, more active or philanthropic than their fellow-countrymen. We do not say they have no faults and vices, that their lives are not sometimes a scandal to the whole world, that they have not much to guard against and plenty of improvement to make. But we maintain that their standard of supernatural virtue and morality, that their sense of a personal relationship towards God, are altogether different from that of the common mass of their fellow-countrymen. The intellectual attitude and state of feeling educed by the life and certainty of faith, create between them and non-Catholics a gulf wider than could exist between the ordinary Englishman and the ordinary Greek or Roman Pagan.

Contrast the country-house, the home of a Catholic and a non-Catholic family in England. You would suppose they were of different zones. The latter may be busy upon public questions, honourable, fair, gentle in bearing, kind to the poor, and holding it correct to attend Church on Sundays. The former has a chapel in the house, and daily Mass and the constant presence of the Blessed Sacrament. There is the early training from childhood, a tenderly constraining love for the Mother of God, familiarity with spiritual books and lives of Saints, who form an unseen companionship; there is the awakening vocation, perhaps, among sweet, and bright, and playful sisters to a life of perpetual self-immolation; then there is their falling out of the ranks of society, one by one, to seek a life of apostleship, or prayer and penance, in the cloister. And is there not in the mind of a Catholic mother a clear appreciation of the truths of faith, a reverence for the Church of God, a love of the Sacraments, a positive dread of mortal sin for her child, which descends to her like an inheritance of Catholic truth? and are not these the pure voices and controlling influences which form the Catholic child? From her knee-side, from off her neck, her boy leaves her to go to college. There he remains seven or eight years.\* He plays,

---

\* "A boy's business when he goes to school is to learn, that is, to store up things in his memory. For some years his intellect is little more than an instrument for taking in facts, or a receptacle for storing them; . . . he has opinions, religious, political, and literary; and, for a boy, is very positive

and studies, and learns ; and the industries of Catholic piety and devotion acquired in childhood increase. He grows up, protected from evil, like a plant by the side of fresh waters. Till now his instruction, secular and religious, has kept pace with his years. He is eighteen or nineteen. What is the wrench which we are now anticipating to take place? He is to be sent to a Protestant University. And, note it well, it is just at the time his reasoning powers are coming to perfection, and the spirit of philosophical inquiry is rising spontaneously in his mind, and the desire arises to analyze the nature of his mind, and to understand the *rationale* of the faith and practice which he imbibed in the confiding trust of childhood. Just at this moment—his first turning-point in life—the crisis, perhaps,—he is to be cut adrift from the old moorings ; and he is launched into the turbid and troublous waters, which from a thousand polluted sources flow into the Protestant University. Better far were it for a youth of inquiring mind to have been sent while a simple boy to a Protestant school than to be sent to a Protestant semi-rationalist University now that his mind is settling into manhood. Many can bear testimony to this ; the late Duke of Norfolk,—who was sent to Cambridge in a time when its religious influence upon the mind was much less active than now, though objectionable religious regulations, since abrogated, were then enforced upon Catholics,—never ceased bitterly to regret having been sent to Cambridge till the day of his death.

But what is this University in its religious aspect? It is the natural product and result of the Protestant heresy and of the public and private schools of the country. Many of these schools have been characterized by their own masters as “sinks of iniquity.” And the appalling evidence given before the Royal Commission on Public Schools in no way disproves the statement.

It has been said, by a person whom we may not name, but whose authority, gravity, and position in Oxford command the respect of all, that “education in Oxford is infidel to the very core.” We are not surprised at the statement. How could it be otherwise?

---

in them and sure about them ; but he gets them from his schoolfellows, or his masters, or his parents, as the case may be. . . . It is the seven years of plenty with him ; he gathers in by handfuls, like the Egyptians, without counting ; and as time goes on, there is exercise for his argumentative powers in the elements of Mathematics, and for his taste in the poets and orators ; still, while at school, or, at least, till quite the last years of his time, he acquires, and little more.”—Discourse V., Scope and Nature of University Education, by Dr. Newman.



It seems to us that Oxford is to the Protestant dissolution in the nineteenth century what the old Alexandrian school was to the dissolving forms of polytheism in the third and fourth centuries. Under the mantle of the neo-Platonic philosophy were gathered, with much that was true, the religious errors of the East and the West. Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblicus, Maximus and Chrysanthus, offered a philosophic apology and an argument in favour of all the gods of Olympus, and they retained yet for a time the departing spirit of the national polytheism. And so in like manner now, a practical and utilitarian philosophy admits into Oxford all comers and all creeds. All may be taken in and shaken together in one mould: they will come out, parts, it is supposed, of a beauteous mosaic.

A warm Oxford advocate for the abolition of religious tests, the Rev. H. Wall, Professor of Logic, writes thus: "Reason and experience confirm the opinion that if Dissenters (and we have the honour to be included under this designation) came for education to the Universities, both Churchmen and Dissenters would be improved—Dissenters would become more Churchmen, and Churchmen would become less bigoted. I believe that dissent (and, of course, Catholicity) has much more to fear than the Church of England has from a University education." In other words, he believed in the assimilating influences of latitudinarian Anglicanism; and so do we. The late Head of a college goes still further, and assumes that the abolition of tests will produce a rapid growth of atheism in Oxford.

And here we must enter a passing criticism upon the study of philosophy in Oxford. Mr. T. D. Acland,\* in a most temperate letter, published in the May of this year, and addressed to the Vice-Chancellor, upon "the Discouragement of Elementary Mathematics in General Education at Oxford," informs us "that elementary mathematics are practically discouraged in Oxford as a branch of preparatory mental discipline . . . and that recent changes, however beneficial in other respects, have not lessened, but increased, this fundamental defect." . . . "The mathematical school has been gradually reduced by various causes; and is not now more than forty per cent. on the men of one year." And it appears that a man may pass through Oxford and take a degree without knowing

---

\* Mr. Acland is M. P. for North Devon, a late Fellow of All Souls, and a Delegate of the Senate of the University of Oxford for Local Examinations.

a single proposition in geometry. From this somewhat discreditable statement, it is clear that mathematics are not the intellectual discipline of Oxford; but classics are. Of this we do not complain. But what we desire to point out as a matter for the deepest consideration of Catholic parents and guardians is, "that a classical scholar, however eminent in scholarship, is *excluded from honours* in the Final Examination, unless he has given a *considerable time to metaphysics*." Mr. Acland laments the "ignorance of common principles and laws of nature," in Oxford, and desires "more security for sound training in exact studies, admitting of definite certainty . . . before young men are plunged into an ocean of doubt about the reality of the faculties, intellectual and moral, with which we are endowed by our Creator." The new system of examinations, he says, "has had the effect of prematurely forcing abstract questions and doubts on minds ill prepared to master them." Note, then, the terrible and radical danger into which every young Catholic, who goes in for honours in classics is at once necessarily plunged. He is obliged to give a considerable time to the Protestant or sceptical or infidel metaphysics of the place; and "he is plunged into an ocean of doubt about the reality of the moral and intellectual faculties," and a thousand other vital questions which arise in metaphysics, and which a Catholic professor alone is properly and safely able to teach. What Oxford professor ever correctly appreciate such writers as Mill, Hamilton, Mansel, Congreve, and the writers of the German school? And these are the works commonly read. What professor ever for a moment dreams of being guided in his investigations and teaching by the light of Revelation and of the Holy See? Here the deadliest poison may be unsuspectedly drunk in. The shipwreck of a Catholic's faith again and again is attributable to his study of unsafe philosophy and metaphysics. This is a question which deserves to be treated at length, but we must pass on to sketch it rather more in the concrete.

Every one has heard of the famous volume of *Essays and Reviews*. They mark an epoch, and may be considered the starting point for modern Oxford Rationalism. Their disciples in Oxford, Fellows and Undergraduates, have already shot far ahead of their masters. But let us hear the true estimate in which these fascinating modern semi-rationalists are held.

Of Dr. Temple, now Head Master of Rugby, it has been said:—"Few men possess in Oxford a higher credit or influence, and none have with more success put themselves at the head of all its most liberal action." Mr. Wilson is spoken of

as "one who has exercised the most powerful influence upon the intellect of Oxford." Mr. Pattison and Mr. Jowett, "have for years been mainly responsible for the education of their respective colleges. Both have been surpassed by few in the influences they have exercised over pupils and colleagues, and the part they have had in the action and progress of Oxford studies. Indeed, as the foremost man of the foremost college, as possessing wide-spread personal influence, as the friend and guide of most of the ablest of the younger students, the Regius Professor of Greek might well be taken as the chief and the mouthpiece of all the fresher and younger intellects of Oxford." And mark, we are not quoting from Catholic sources, but from Oxford, and from the best intellectual observers in England of the advance of modern thought.

Consider for a moment what may be the immediate and personal influence of a tutor. Although, as a rule, the moral power of tutors over their pupils may be small, yet sometimes we know that it is the most fascinating, the most subtle, and the most constraining. Instances of this abound, for good and for evil. Take a tutor actuated by the idea of education enunciated by Dean Stanley, for instance; he truly says: "Sympathy is the secret of power, no artificial self-adaptation, no merely official or pastoral relation has an influence equal to that which is produced by the consciousness of a human personal affection in the mind of a teacher towards his scholar." Or again, by Dr. Hook, Vicar of Leeds: "No educational result, that deserved the name, was produced otherwise than by contact of human living soul with human living soul;" or by the Rev. S. Hawtrey, who speaks of the absolute necessity of "getting hold of and acting on the human heart;" or by another who talks of "individualising the pupils." Who does not see what an immense power such an animating principle as this confers upon a tutor over his pupil, a power which, we will not say may be used to corrupt his morals, but his faith, and even this not designedly?

A youth is full of warm affections and sympathies; he is perplexed, as is often the case on the threshold of manhood, with doubts and difficulties concerning himself, his constitution, his duties, his principles, his faith: he is inclined to generous confidence; he feels inwardly the desire for the support and sympathy of a friend, whom he dares not seek, whom perhaps before he has never felt the need of. Such a youth, if he falls in with an intelligent, gentle, affectionate tutor, will become moulded and inspired by him, and nearly the whole religious system of his boyhood may be insensibly undone, as unintelligent and inadequate. For what security have you that your

son's tutor may not secretly and practically be even a Deist or a Pantheist in religion? His cultivated mind, his generous sympathetic nature, his winning ways, his correct conduct, are no proof against this. He may have his own clear view of the problem of life, of the human soul, and his own philosophical solution and way out of all religious difficulties whatever. The very natural goodness of his heart may all the more subtly deceive the judgment of your confiding son and may serve him as a solid path, terminating in the ruin of his supernatural faith on the low level of a devout naturalism. There is no end to the power of generous and intelligent sympathy, or the influence, as Dr. Hook would express it, of the "contact of the human living soul with the human living soul."

And parents have no security as to who their son's tutor shall be when he is sent to Oxford.

This, moreover, is certain: the *minds of all*—Heads, professors, and tutors—are more or less poisoned and deformed with heresy; and the most active, the most attractive, and most inquiring minds, if you except a few Puseyites and Ritualists, are latitudinarian and rationalistic. There is every probability that in another session the test of religion and Christianity will be wholly abolished; there will then be no legal bar to as rank an infidelity as any in Germany, entering into the privileges and powers of the governing body of the colleges and University.

The real and the professed aim of University reform, be it remembered, is to educate the mind of the country. And as speculative religion can no more be excluded from the mind than the presence of God from the world, it stands to reason that the religious *ἡθός* of Oxford must be a solution of the rationalistic and anti-Catholic tendency of the country. Are we to plunge our Catholic sons into such a miasma as this? The very dissenters themselves, we are assured by Mr. Jowett, in his evidence taken this year, "are kept away because they come to a set of teachers in whom they have no confidence and with whom they have no sympathy."

Now observe, from another point of view, the mischief in Oxford to a young Catholic who is to enter public life. In a day such as ours, and in our state of society, it is essential that an educated Catholic should be thoroughly formed on Catholic philosophy and the *rationale* of his religion. This is the study not of the schoolboy but of the man. Now, whatever else is taught him at the University, this is not. To fix attention to our meaning, take as an instance the doctrines implied by the Syllabus. The Pope claims to have a supreme voice upon the moral principles on which society should move

and live. He has infallibly condemned many principles current in modern society in a Syllabus of eighty propositions. All Catholics are called upon to reject those propositions; many of the doctrines implied in them are not purely religious, social and practical, and so must affect and govern the principles and conduct of a Catholic in many of the social and political relations of his life. But how can a beardless youth, in the atmosphere of the Common Rooms, lectures, supper parties, and society of Oxford, be expected thoroughly to imbue his mind and life with such topics as these? How can he form himself upon doctrines which he always hears derided or pitied, or which are only suggested to him by the difficulties he hears brought forward against them? He may be told to read in private; but practically the only course left open to him is to attract as little attention as possible to his religious principles, and above all things to avoid ground on which he has not been thoroughly instructed. His best chance is silence. He is but a unit in a hostile camp, and not armed with a Chassepot or a Snider. He is but a boy; like David, unused to war; but, unlike David, he has neither the grace nor the skill to use a sling and five pebbles out of the brook, and attack a giant clothed in the armour of the Philistines.

The sanctity of early traditions, the instruction of boyhood, his faith, may serve him much; but they do not supply him with all the reasons and arguments he needs. He had received instruction proportioned to a boy; he is now the associate of keen, searching intellects; they have little reverence for what is holy, if *they* understand it not. And he can explain only so far as he has been taught and remembers.

But it may be said that the natural pugnacity, the chivalry of an Englishman, will make him hold his own if attacked. We make full allowance for this noble quality, and admit it; but to attack, and bully, and brow-beat is not the way at Oxford; it were safer for the young Catholic if it were. He would make a better martyr than a confessor. In the fable, the warmth of the sun beat the strength of the wind, and gentleness is more difficult to withstand than violence.

We have not touched upon the subject of morality. It is a delicate topic. It shall be dismissed as speedily as possible after a few quotations from Oxford evidence. The Proctors have full authority to close any house of ill name in the city, and no doubt this authority is occasionally exercised; but there is also a party who "look upon bad houses as a necessary evil, and hold that purity is increased by the presence of temptation."

But let the Rector of Lincoln again kindly give us the benefit of his long experience. He says:—

It is to be feared that the moral and religious standard with which a well-disposed youth comes up from a pious home would not be elevated by a close and habitual intercourse with the Senior Common Room. The habits and manners, therefore, which gave the conventual system its good effects being changed, we must not think any virtue resides in its mere forms. If little or nothing of moral influence is obtained by intramural residence, neither is the college gate any mechanical security against dissolute habits. The three great temptations of the place I suppose to be fornication, wine, and cards, or betting. Without exaggerating the turpitude of the first-named vice, yet every one who is aware of the amount of moral and intellectual prostration traceable to it here, must wish that every protection against temptation should be afforded to the weak and unsteady. It may be left to any one to estimate what amount of such protection is given by the necessity of being within doors by midnight.—“Evidence,” p. 43.

The Rev. H. Wall, Fellow and Bursar of Balliol, is speaking of his twenty-two years’ residence:—

I wish I could say that the discipline of Oxford had much capacity for becoming worse. I wish I could say that immorality had yet to be introduced among our students.

As to the personal superintendence of college tutors—if any parent thinks that when he enters his son at a college he *necessarily* puts him where his moral and intellectual training will be carefully watched by a tutor—I can only assure him that he is under a pleasing delusion. I do not deny that some college tutors *try* to exercise this superintendence; but, after all, what *personal* superintendence *can* a tutor exercise over twenty or thirty pupils—young men who must be left to themselves for the greater part of the day, who have their own rooms, and are as much separated from their tutor as if they lived at the other end of the town? This *personal* superintendence may be *desirable*, but it is not a reality.—“Evidence,” p. 148.

We must here quote from the evidence of Dr. Pusey, given on the 22nd of July in the present year, before Mr. Ewart’s Select Committee. He says:—

Neither Oxford nor Cambridge is a small town; and I am afraid that there is as much opportunity of vice in Oxford as anywhere else; *it has most terribly changed in my own memory.*

Dr. Pusoy was asked whether he was able to say, from the nature of the evidence before him that the cases of immorality which have arisen in lodgings in Oxford are exclusively attributable to the members of the University. He replied that



the evidence went to that effect: that the names of persons and colleges had been mentioned incidentally, and in such a way as not in the least to give the impression that the unfortunate persons were telling lies. As to seduction, he said it is on the side of the poor women. He had made inquiries of a lady of family and education, for ten years interested in reclaiming the unfortunate women of Oxford; and he had received a list of seventeen houses of ill-fame, several of which were not known to the police. It was perfectly exceptional for any poor women, being natives of Oxford, not to have begun their bad career in a lodging-house. Servants in these lodging-houses are probably the least respectable class of young women. The master and mistress go to bed at their own time, and, contrary to the rule, the key is left with the maid, and she has to let in the person who is lodging in the house at twelve o'clock at night, when everybody else is asleep. The ideas of morality of the poorer lodging-house keepers were exceedingly low; they connived at things that were going on wrong. . . . He quotes a member of the Board of Guardians at Oxford as saying that it was important to stretch a point to keep a young person in the workhouse, because the alternative of going to a lodging-house would be her destruction. "As for regulations, they are simply not kept; although there are regulations at this moment with regard to the lodging-houses."

It appears that only two years ago three successive Proctors brought the terrible state of mischief effected by the lodging-houses upon the University before a committee of the Hebdomadal Council, to which Dr. Pusey himself belonged. A plan was proposed to the congregation, "finally we gave it up, thinking that regulations would really be of no use whatever."

The Rev. T. V. Bayne, Censor of Christ Church, at present Senior Proctor of the University, gave his evidence before the same Select Committee with great caution and reserve. It was elicited, however, that the moral tone of the University has not improved, but has deteriorated during the last fifteen or twenty years; that there are more dissolute women, more temptations thrown in men's way, and that he is afraid they yield to them; moreover that the University has done nothing to invigorate the discipline by a stricter observance of rules, or by more extensive superintendence; though he (Mr. Bayne) has endeavoured to do what he could.

The *Pall Mall Gazette*, in speaking of such evidence, as this which we have adduced, treats it lightly and as of "quite a secondary importance." And there is abundant proof for

the assertion that the University itself is fatally stamped with the loose principles of the day upon this grave and anxious matter. In fact, there is nothing clearer from the evidence of the action taken within the University and in Parliament, than that efforts are really and steadily directed to extend the intellectual influence of the University, and to draw men within its power, but that those things which Catholics consider to be essential and vital points of morality, are either not provided for at all, or are treated as puerile and of mere "secondary importance."

It will be remembered that we have already contrasted the difference in tone and principle between Catholic and non-Catholic homes. If this difference is to be erased in the future—if we who have the faith and the Sacraments are to aspire to no higher a perfection than to that of those who have them not, then let the anxious father and the pious mother send their son to Oxford; but let them first read the following words in the Report of the Oxford Commission, and then ask themselves whether this is the social norma they wish to work towards. The Report runs thus:—

"The real causes of extravagance," says Professor Walker, "are the state of society in general, and the weakness of parents who wish their sons to be like other young men." "A different tone of social morality," says Mr. Congreve, "on the two points of extravagance and idleness must prevail both at Oxford and in the country generally, before there can be any effectual check on these evils. Among the higher classes of English society public opinion on these points is very lax. To spend more than their income, to waste their time, and to be moderately disorderly in conduct, have been and still are so usual in ordinary English education of the upper classes, that they are tolerated by a very indulgent treatment in society—treated as privileges of the rich and easy classes, and only complained of by the great majority of such classes when they lead to too marked a failure or to too heavy bills." "Some parents who are rich, but not distinguished by rank, are too often glad to place their sons on a par, as regards expenditure, at least, with those of higher birth, or even to give them a larger allowance. Some even of those who are not rich prefer an expensive college, and do not greatly repine at follies committed in aristocratic company."—Report, p. 28.

We read in the touching history of Arnold's life, that he used to weep by himself over the innocent boy as he entered public school, knowing for certain that his corruption was at hand. We do not know whether Mr. Pattison weeps over Oxford, but his words are remarkable: "It is at least doubtful," he says, "whether our corrupting and enervating influences do not preponderate over those which invigorate and elevate the mind."

After this, we feel almost inclined to ask ourselves whether there is not some truth in the terrible principle laid down by Mr. J. S. Mill in his inaugural lecture at St. Andrew's, when he enunciated that "it is beyond the power of schools and universities to educate morally or religiously." What Dr. Arnold and Mr. Pattison have implied of Rugby and Oxford respectively, Mr. Mill declares of all schools and universities.

*Three classes of objections may be alleged: to which we reply with brevity.*

I. It is urged that whatever is said against Oxford may be equally urged as an argument against entering the navy, the army, medicine, the law, or the civil service.

Now, firstly, life at Oxford is not a profession, but an education: and Oxford prepares men, directly, for no profession, save that of Anglican Orders.

Secondly, Catholics are obliged to enter professions in order to earn their bread, but Catholics are not obliged to be educated at Oxford.

Thirdly, and far most importantly, as it seems to us, there are intellectual dangers peculiar to Oxford from the fact of its being a seat of education and of literary and philosophic inquiry, which do not at all exist in any of the professions. We must insist upon this, even though we trespass on the patience of our reader.

Dr. Newman,\* in speaking of the office of a University to enlarge the mind, says that—

The communication of knowledge is either a condition or the means of the sense of enlargement or enlightenment . . . but it is equally plain that such communication is not the whole of the process. The enlargement consists, not merely in the passive reception into the mind of a number of ideas hitherto unknown to it, but in the mind's simultaneous action upon and towards and among those new ideas, which are rushing in upon it. It is the action of a formative power, reducing to order and meaning the matter of our acquirements; it is the making the objects of our knowledge subjectively our own . . . it is a digestion of what we receive into the substance of our previous state of thought; and without this no enlargement is said to follow. There is no enlargement, unless there be a comparison of ideas one with another, as they come before the mind, and a systematizing of them . . . A mind thus enlarged possesses the knowledge, not only of things, but also of their mutual and true relations: knowledge, not merely considered as acquirement, but as philosophy. Accordingly, when this analytical, distributive, harmonizing process is away, the mind experiences no enlargement.

---

\* Discourse V. The Scope and Nature of University Education.

From this remarkable passage we perceive what is the distinctive office of a University education towards the mind.

Now, what would be the result to the mind in this "analytical, distributive, harmonizing process;" what would be the estimate of the "mutual and true relations of things," if in the communication of knowledge the chief branch of knowledge were ignored? What, if the most important branch of all, the knowledge of Christ and His Church, were kept out of sight, and the mind left only with that perception of it which it had acquired in boyhood? The result would be that the mind, so enlarged would form its views, and would harmonize its opinions and judgments, leaving religion practically on one side. It would assimilate only that which it had digested. The intellectual draught of knowledge, which was the "condition or the means of its enlargement," had been composed with the principal ingredient of a philosophical knowledge of religion left out; and the consequence is that the truths of his religion have no weight or place in the mind and views of an intellectual man, thus formed. He is a cultivated *man*, but not a cultivated *Catholic*. And he who has not been expressly and laboriously trained in the intellectual principles of Catholicism will, at a place like Oxford, imbibe subtly and unconsciously, but for that very reason with the more deadly effect, intellectual principles abhorrent to Catholicism.

But now consider more particularly the case, not of ordinary youths, but of those pre-eminent for active intellect; of those, therefore, who will mainly influence the new generation towards good or towards evil. And here we adopt not only the thought, but almost the words of another writer on this subject in the October number of 1864.

In a University such as Oxford a vigorous intellectual cultivation is given to such minds as these; but it is accompanied by no proportionate knowledge of Christian doctrine and of the unapproachable intellectual greatness of Catholicism.

Add to this two most certain and palpable facts: first, the Catholic student is brought into familiar intercourse with the most able and influential Protestants of his own age whom England produces; and these are unanimous in regarding the maxims of the Papacy, theological, social, and political, as a synonym for everything which is narrow, retrograde, and imbecile. Secondly, his religious knowledge is imperfect, his principles are not yet firmly rooted (as is evident from the very fact that his education is still in progress); the intrinsic bias of the intellect, apart from Divine grace, is intensely opposed to intellectual submission of any kind, and intellectual

pride is the deadly enemy of docility to the Holy See, and is the high road to apostacy. Nevertheless his intellect expands and strengthens; and as his habitual associates are intellectual men, who make intellectual independence their very boast, he too necessarily becomes like them, intellectually proud and independent of authority. He becomes angry, or grows contemptuous, or chafes under the teaching of the Holy See; for he has *not* studied and mastered *her* system, and at the same time her teaching and her spirit are definite and practical, and always demand his submission and interior assent. Thus his intellectual excellency becomes the occasion of his inward rebellion against the Church, perhaps of his open apostacy.

Now, nothing in the least like this holds in the case of a profession. It has been remarked that men of uncultivated minds possess a singular power of contemplating moral phenomena without forming on them any judgment of their own: they are not tempted to intellectual pride in the way that men of vigorously cultivated minds are.

They receive, as Dr. Newman says, in a passive, otiose, unfruitful way, the various facts which are forced upon them . . . Like seafaring men who range from one end of the earth to the other; . . . they sleep, and rise up, and they find themselves, now in Europe, now in Asia; they see visions of great cities and wild regions; . . . and nothing which meets them, carries them forward or backward, to any idea beyond itself. Nothing has a drift or relation; nothing has a history or a promise. Everything stands by itself, and comes and goes in its turn, like the shifting scenes of a show, which leave the spectator where he was.

Just so, the ordinary professions and avocations of life may leave a man, with regard to all things, except those which directly belong to his profession. But not so the University, which professes to form and enlarge his mind, to form the judgment and to teach it the "true and mutual relations and harmony of things." You see, therefore, how fundamentally different must be the effect upon the mind of the action of a University, and the partial and fragmentary teaching of a profession.

II. Next, as to the prospect of Oxford being converted to Catholicity through Catholics frequenting it for education; the idea is fond and futile. Even were our young men saints, they could not be recommended to embark on such an undertaking. Saints would not attempt it by such a method. S. Gregory, the Divine, speaking of himself and of his companion, S. Basil, during the perilous period of their higher studies, writes thus instructively:—

We knew only two streets, and chiefly the first of these, which led us to the Church, and to the holy teachers and doctors who there attended the service of the altar, and nourished the flock of Christ with the food of life. The other street with which we were acquainted, but which we held in much less esteem, was the road to the schools, and to our masters in the sciences. We left to others the streets which led to the theatre, to spectacles, feasting, and diversions. We made it our only and great affair; it was our only aim, and all our glory, to be called, and to be Christians . . . We did not keep company with students that were impious, rude, or impertinent, but with those that were the best and the most peaceable, and with those whose conversation brought us much profit, being persuaded that *it is an illusion to seek the company of sinners, on pretence to reform or convert them*; it is far more to be feared that they will *communicate their poison to us than that we shall impart to them our virtue*.\*

These are remarkable words indeed; not only because they come from the lips of so great a Doctor and Saint—a man versed in the knowledge of the world; but because we know *aliunde* that in spite of these watchful precautions S. Basil had become so touched with pride and conceit through the influence of the University, that had it not been for the tearful prayers and influence of his sister, S. Macrina, who induced him to abandon the schools, he never would have become a Saint, or merited from the Church the title of “the Great.”

M. de Montalembert has set forth, in his work on the “Monks of the West,” that paganism and the religious errors fostered in the national academies of the empire were destroyed not so much by the great Fathers and teachers of the Church as by the action of Divine Providence, which broke them up with the empire, by the hordes of barbarians from the North. These settled down with simplicity of mind and heart, and received from the Church, chiefly through the teaching of the Religious Orders, the pure doctrines of Christianity.

S. Jerome’s writings are full of anger and sorrow over the way in which the few Christians who frequented the State Universities insensibly imbibed Pagan principles, and the undermining effect of popular Paganism upon the Christian people.

We see little prospect of converting Oxford and Cambridge to the authority of the Catholic Church: they yearly travel to a greater distance from her teaching. They become more contemptuously indifferent to supernatural faith, more rationalistic, more latitudinarian; and they gladly receive into their bosom every form of creed or of unbelief. No doubt, a com-

---

\* S. Greg., Theol. Or., 43.



munity of learned priests, thoroughly zealous and active, might snatch many a brand from the burning. But this is altogether different from sending young Catholics to Oxford for education. One thing is certain: it is a greater evil for a Catholic to lose the brightness of spiritual vision, and the instincts and sympathies of the faith, than for a Protestant to be left in the ignorance in which he has been brought up.

We purposely avoid entering upon the subject of a Catholic college at Oxford. It was a project put forward some years ago by persons as desirous as ourselves for the common good. But it was considered, and finally set aside by the highest authority. It is, therefore, neither necessary nor desirable to reopen the discussion. We may remark, however, in passing, that, whatever might become the character and the influence of such a college, it would render the future foundation of a Catholic University morally impossible, for it would effectually tap the small stream of our Catholic youth, and establish a tradition all the more difficult to break up, because of its worldly and local fascinations, and of the expenditure and foundations to which it would have given rise.

Were a Catholic hall in Oxford permitted, as an act of expediency and condescension to the wants of the moment, and were some to build a college, and were others to endow it with a number of Fellowships, it would become, not only morally, but *legally* impossible to apply them to the establishment of a Catholic University. Such a permission would be to build up obstacles to the work, which all Catholics must have at heart.

III. A last objection. It will be said that we have made no admissions in favour of Oxford education; that we are blind to its benefits because we see its evils. We have no desire to shirk the truth. We are quick to admit that there are two considerable advantages which Oxford presents to her sons. The first is intellectual: and consists in the friction and attrition of mind with mind. This is the process of eliciting and stimulating the mental powers by the presence and action of superior and varied abilities, guarded by laws imposed by mutual respect and self-restraint. It is the refining, smoothing, and polishing process of intellectual contact and attrition, as of pebbles in a running stream. It is the chastening of the rawness and rudeness of boyhood.

But even this, undeniable boon as it is, is half paralyzed by the Oxford system, if we may believe the evidence of her own sons, one of whom declares that, "between the Heads and Fellows of the same society there is a distance; between the Fellows and the Undergraduates *an impassable gulf*. And

yet the junior Fellows (the usual residents) and the Undergraduates are not so much removed from each other in years, as to impede an unembarrassed and friendly intercourse." Another yet weightier authority truly remarks, that "the insensible action of the teacher's character on the pupil's is the most valuable part of any education; and any scheme which involved the loss of this influence would be much to be deprecated. But it is contended that this influence is not now exerted by the body of Fellows on the Undergraduates. College life has ceased to be the life in common, even for the Fellows, that it once was: as between the Fellows as a body and the students it creates *no society whatever*. Our existing system of college habits so far separates the Undergraduate from the Fellow that his merely being lodged under the same roof makes him no real member of the family, brings him into no contact with his seniors. The relation between the student and the college official is, in general, as distant and technical as that between the officer and the private in our army. The young men associate with and form one another's character mainly."

We only remark that this was not the old Catholic system at Oxford, and that such drawbacks to mental and moral friction and training could not exist in a Catholic University.

But we fully admit that we Catholics are called upon to make some sacrifices for the salvation of our souls. We cannot have all that this world offers, and secure the joys of the next. And we think, in the matter of University education, that the particular point we must be willing to forego, in part, is the advantage of that peculiar mental friction which belongs to Oxford and Cambridge. We cannot, indeed, hope to bring together for long years to come the same number of undergraduates as there are gathered at Oxford, and therefore we must rest satisfied to be shorn of the benefit which springs out of great numbers. But, on the other hand, of this we may be certain, that there will never be "*an impassable gulf*" between our students and their masters. And that the constant contact with their superiors, men of ability and high education, will have an elevating tendency and a power of attrition far beyond anything which is generated at Oxford by a congeries of untrained youths brought together from the Protestant schools of England.

The other advantage which we allow to Oxford is one we should be glad to insist upon, did space permit. It is one, however, which it is perfectly open to us to share. It is this: the wisdom of putting a youth into rooms, enlarging his liberty, and permitting his visits to home to be longer

and more frequent. He is thus gradually prepared to enter the world and public life. *To learn how to use our liberty* is a great business of education. The "rod of discipline" must, "with a great reverence" and charity, indeed, be held in the hand of another for the boy; but it ought betimes to be passed into his own hand, that he may wisely learn to use it upon himself during life. Here, again, Protestantism has been a mar-plot in the system of education. Sloth, gambling, moral evil, and extravagance are brought into too close proximity to youth. Liberty is not learned by license. We believe a Catholic English University, bent upon driving a wedge into English public life, would offer a far higher security to the right use of liberty than Universities which must daily become more common, more rationalistic, and therefore more unrestrained in thought and act.

To sum up, and to take leave of this part of our subject.

We thoroughly recognize the high motives which actuated several Catholic parents in sending their sons to Oxford as soon as Oxford was open to receive them. They sought the best intellectual culture for their children, the best preparation for their after-life. So far good: we ardently desire to second their noble aspirations. But they knew not the peculiar dangers of Oxford—how should they?—and the Church had not then clearly spoken. But the question has since been examined in principle and in detail, and the Church has now plainly declared that "parents are to be in all ways dissuaded from sending their sons to the Protestant Universities." It is not for us to explain the petition, "Lead us not into temptation," nor to insist upon the sinfulness of frequenting the proximate occasions of sin. This is not the province of a public reviewer; but we may take leave to point out, however briefly, what appear to us will be the natural consequences, the natural fruit of Catholics continuing to go up to Oxford.

(1.) They will grow up imbued, as we have shown in an earlier page, with the principles of a false philosophy; in ignorance, therefore, of Christian philosophy; and, as we have also seen, in ignorance of those points of their religion which it most behoves them in these days, as men of education and position, to understand and defend. They will present, therefore, the shameful spectacle of men of cultivated intellect undervaluing and holding cheap the most practical doctrines of their religion, and unable to explain or justify them.

(2.) They will form a school, more or less united, of *liberal, rationalizing* Catholics: because this is the atmosphere of young Oxford; and this is the intellectual attitude forced upon all educated Catholics, who are indifferent to

their religion, or ignorant of its proper influence and imperative claims, or are bent on the delusive scheme of reconciling the maxims of the world and of the Church, and on joining the broad and narrow ways together.

They will be *jealous of Rome*; for they have lived in an atmosphere saturated with hatred and contempt for Rome;—*jealous of Rome*, because they do not study, or listen with docility to, the constant teaching of Rome, or conform their judgment to hers concerning the evils and errors which are ever cropping up in human society;—*jealous of Rome*, in a word, because they began to act in opposition to her, by disregarding her warning voice when she spoke to them against mixed education. Such a disposition of disregard for her authority must increase so long as they persevere in it.

They will become *abettors of nationalism in religion*. Every influence in Oxford is in this direction. The history of England for 500 years before the Reformation; her history for 300 years since; the national character; the spirit of independence; the example of all around them; the absence of those who could speak truly and deeply from a Catholic point of view; a false notion of patriotism; an ingrained pride and mistrust of others whom they will learn to consider narrow-minded and unenlightened (perhaps for no better reason than because they have not been educated in a Protestant University), will practically lead them to gravitate to the happily exploded principles of the old Cisalpine Club.

(3.) They will probably be found to keep aloof from Catholics on Catholic questions. They will be wiser than the wise: they will enjoy an enlightenment above their fellows. They will be suspected by Catholics, and they will resent that suspicion with contempt. Or else they will act at times boldly and enter into the field, as a wolf in sheep's clothing; and behave according to the bias and character of the education they have received.

When the trial comes, they will choose the world; they will sell their master for thirty pieces of silver; for a smile at Court; or for the praise of men; or to obtain a place, or for the bauble of some earthly gain. There will be apostates from such a school, as there always have been.

(4.) Or if their temptation is to immorality, they will probably exceed even Protestants and Rationalists in evil and extravagance;—proving to the world that their religion holds them no tighter than their associates in crime, and illustrating again the too well-known maxim "*corruptio optimi pessima*."

Of course there will continue to exist counteracting influ-

ences upon many such Catholics, though not on all ; such as family tradition, hereditary Catholic policy, domestic relations, early associations, and the training of boyhood. It will be well if they prevail. Sometimes they have prevailed, in the end : it is probable they will sometimes prevail again ; but we have no security ; we must take the rule, not the exception ; and we have abundant proofs and examples that pride of intellect, contact with error, tampering with faith, love of the world, the pursuit of ambition, which are essentially kindled and nurtured in such godless temples of learning, are too apt to trample upon divine grace and its instincts, when these stand between a man and his strong desires.

It may be said that ordinary and every-day youths will not be exposed in the same degree to these intellectual dangers. But they will be exposed to them indirectly, for they will learn to regard liberal and rationalizing Catholics as the recognized leaders of Catholic thought. And to the temptations against morality they will be ever more susceptible than are the able and intellectual.

If it be said that we have overcoloured the evils and magnified the prospect of danger, we fully admit that in Oxford there is much which is good, while we deny the allegation that we have overcoloured the evil or magnified the danger.

It is not so much a question of quantity as of quality. We treat of poisons : and mixed education is a deadly poison. That the poison be administered in "a golden cup," or in honest bread and homely fare, matters little. Oxford is poison to true Catholic life. Of how many soever other ingredients Oxford may boast, there is not one which is *love of Rome*.

We have performed an ungracious and a painful task ; and certainly we should never have interfered in the affairs of Oxford had not Oxford, by inviting our youth, made herself a *domestic* question ; and had not an exaggerated estimate of her merits become a dangerous bait and a snare to some of our own Catholics. Have we written with a view to destroy all hope of University education for Catholics ? Far from it. We have wished to demonstrate the necessity of a Catholic University which should crown and complete the educational establishments which flourish amongst us.

### III.

It would be beyond our province, as a Catholic periodical, to bring forward any plan of our own for a Catholic University ; to exhibit schemes without authority, and to challenge idle discussions as to ways and means. Such a matter is in the hands of others ; and is vested ultimately in the Holy See.

It is not, therefore, for us to bring in the bill. There are however a few general and broad observations which we conceive may be permitted to us.

In estimating our future we own that we are not of those sanguine and happy temperaments, who see no difficulties in any path before them. But then we know that the timid and the slothful always descry "a lion in the road" and "a lioness in the path," and build up mountains out of mole-hills. They never help on any work; they never put their shoulder to the wheel, until the wheel moves on the plain. We feel convinced that innumerable difficulties may be raised against attempting even the first step towards a Catholic University. It will be said that we are too poor,—as though everything was to be begun at once; it will be urged that they who desire University education are too few,—as though there was nothing in the maxim of economy that "the supply creates the demand;" and as though we ought not to plant the acorn because we may not live to enjoy its shade. Rather, we think that they render a greater service to mankind who bring clearly into view the end to be made for, than those do who from the outset morbidly delight to sum up and collect all the difficulties they can find—the stones and steeps and "lions" of the way—and so discourage the heart of the multitude which has neither set out nor sees a mile ahead, and is always for sitting down or turning out of the road.

If we do not, therefore, begin by introducing an army of objections, it will not be understood that we are blind to their existence. We believe that each in its own time will be overcome when fairly met. We are convinced that not one is endowed with the privilege of being indomitable. Difficulties may slacken, but will not arrest our course. After these remarks we venture to point out, most briefly, the following broad facts.

The elements of a University are among us:—

1. We have twelve or fourteen principal colleges\* in England; and it is ascertained that we are giving a liberal education to more than 2,000 students. Many of these for age or advancement correspond to the freshmen and undergraduates of Oxford and Cambridge.

2. We have Religious Orders, who make education their profession and an object of their existence, notably the devoted Society of Jesus, with their resources in learned men to draw from all over the Continent.

---

\* Old Hall, Ushaw, Stonyhurst, Oscott, Prior Park, Downside, Ampleforth, Douai, Beaumont, Edgbaston, Everton, Ratcliffe, S. Beuno's, Belmont, &c., &c.



3. We have communities of Secular priests given up to science and letters at Ushaw, Oscott, and Old Hall, to mention only their principal houses of education. The spirit or the vow of poverty and the mortified life of the priest are a security against the claims for high remuneration put forth at Oxford and Cambridge.

4. There is also a list of laymen, who could render most efficient service by lectures in their own departments of science.

5. A Charter and power to confer degrees might be presumed upon from the favour of the Holy See ; and there is no reason why these degrees should not come to acquire for their possessors equal honour with those of Oxford and Cambridge.

6. As to degrees recognized by the law of the land, already nearly all our colleges are affiliated to the London University ; nor can there be any grave objection to the members of a Catholic University entering in like manner into a similar participation, so long as it may be necessary.

7. But if the Catholics of England founded a University of their own, we might, judging from the example of Ireland, and from the tendency of the times to favour education in all its branches and to erect Universities, expect, in due course, to obtain a legal charter. If Ireland secures such a charter within ten years, why may not we look for one within twenty ? But one thing is certain ; we must work for it and merit it, if we are to earn it from the sense of justice and love of education in the English people.

Among the advantages to be looked forward to from a Catholic University for our laity we shall confine ourselves to singling out two, which seem special and practical.

1. The establishment of a School of Catholic Philosophy, which may prepare our youth against the intellectual and increasing dangers of the day, and make a front to the rationalistic philosophy of Oxford, Cambridge, London, and the Universities of the North.

In the Roman College there is a School of the Philosophy of Religion : and if this is important for the Italian laity, it is ten times more so for the English.

2. Little or no practical attention is given in the Universities to the study of law, though some improvement has taken place in Oxford. Now not only is law a recognised instrument, just as the classical languages and mathematics are, for educating and training the powers of the mind ; but it is one of those practical subjects, dealing with the lives, liberties, properties, and fortunes of all, which cannot fail to

give interest, power, and influence to all who have studied it. Let our eldest sons and country gentlemen receive instruction on the principles of Christian jurisprudence, of the British constitution and of our common law ; let the principal questions of political and social economy, which are at the root of all the upheavings and maladies of our modern society, be brought before them in a harmonious and well-digested form ; and you will confer upon them a singular power of influence, and fit them to fill with credit and advantage their social position. We quote from a work of admitted ability, by Mr. Toulmin Smith, on “ Local Self-Government,” the following passage :—

The first and chief point in the secular education of a free people ought to be a thorough knowledge and understanding of the principles on which the institutions and laws they live under are founded. But if there is one subject less studied and less understood than another in England it is this. Neither in our schools, our colleges, nor universities is it taught ; nor does the literature of the day help its acquisition.

If this were made a point of attention in a Catholic University, it would soon be found that our Catholic young men would feel a greater confidence in their own powers, and a more intelligent interest in the political and social work of their country. We should cease to hear of the backwardness of our higher classes in public life : they would take their proper place, and exercise their proper influence, in the life and progress of the country.

And, further, if we may refer to the more immediate advantage to be derived by the clergy from such an institution, it might become of inestimable value, by stimulating philosophical and theological studies, by exciting a healthy emulation among students scattered throughout the country, by giving a high standard and constant impulse to the small classes in our seminaries,—through the means of common examinations, public results, degrees, and scholarships.

One caution we ought all to bear in mind. Such a work must begin in humility, and, as it were, from the seed. Palatial buildings, abundant means, imposing array, and large numbers are the result of time and generations. How the beginning should be made, it is not for us to suggest ; but as we know, that a very small seed, if duly planted and nurtured, may send up so large and stately a tree, that in due time the fowls of the air may find rest and nourishment in branches.

In order to achieve the foundation of a Catholic University individuals must be prepared for sacrifices for more than

generation. There must be no slaking of thirst in the great muddy water because the pure stream is small. There should be no murmuring and sadness because the Rhone is not at its source what it is a hundred miles down, or at its mouth. Let every streamlet pour in its quota, and before we think for it we shall be floating on the broad bosom of a river. Few reflect on the reserve of strength which lies hidden within the million and a half Catholics in England when multiplied by fifty years. If any one is discouraged at the prospect of difficulties, let him look into the chapters of the second volume of "Christian Schools." He will there find the indications of how our great seats of learning and the universities began. Sixty-six universities covered Europe before the Reformation; as they were needed they arose—some out of a school of boys, as Cambridge; some by combinations among the religious orders and the clergy, towards a common centre, as at Caen, and, in some measure, at Oxford and Paris; some were the result of a quarrel among professors, as at Padua. Nearly all were initiated by the Church, and all were supported by the clergy and laity together. He will find in how great humility, poverty, trouble, disorder, and without other compass than their faith, these marts of learning were planted. It was in more troublous times than ours that wisdom built herself a home beside the waters of the Isis and the Cam.

The Church is as growing and vigorous to-day as she was eight or eighteen centuries ago. She does not tire of rebuilding the walls that have been pulled down, nor of replanting where the "wild boar" has uprooted. At the Reformation she lost in England 681 monasteries of men and women. During the first half of the present century she has replaced them by 260 religious houses and colleges; and at this proportion, by the close of the century, we shall have nearly equalled the number which were left after 800 years of Catholic sway and royal protection.

If any one is discouraged, we repeat, let him study the history of the Church throughout the world, and he will discover therein the tokens of encouragement for our future. He will perceive that all great works have been achieved against great odds; that their foundations have been laid in the earnestness of self-sacrifice on the part of women and men; and that upon this basis they have been wondrously built up by the Power and Love of God.

We have seen the growth and perfection of our colleges during the past half-century. It is not presumptuous to expect to behold their "crown and flower" arise during the second half of this same century.

## ART. VI.—THE FIRST AND THE SECOND MAN.\*

*Ecce Homo.* London and Cambridge : Macmillan & Co.

LET us look back on the space which we have traversed, and gather up in a few words the sight which it presents to us. We have man before us as far as history will carry us back, as far as reasoning, planting itself on the scanty traces of history, will penetrate into the cloudland of pre-historic times : and the result stands before us exhibited in the manifold records still remaining of the most renowned ancient civilization. Here, then, we see nations whose genius, whether in history, poetry and literature, or in works of art, or in civil government, we still admire, comprising men in many of whom the powers of reason reached their utmost limit ; nations inhabiting the most varied climates and countries, and amongst them the fairest in the world, nations formed under the most different circumstances, and pursuing the most distinct employments, some agricultural, some commercial, some inland, some nautical, but alike in this that they were enthralled by systems of a false worship, of which it is hard to say whether it was the more revolting to the reason by its absurdity, or to the conscience of man by its foulness. And this false worship does not lie distinct and apart from the concerns of daily civil and domestic life, but is intertwined with all the public and private actions of men, forming their habits and ruling their affections. Moreover, the polytheistic idolatry described above as existing at the time of Augustus in every province of his empire except one, in almost† every country which touched upon it, or was known to it, is the result, the summing up, the embodiment of man's whole history up to that time, so far as we know it : it is that into which this history had run out, its palpable, it almost seemed, its irresistible, form. And it amounts to a complete corruption, first of the relation between man and his Creator, secondly of the relation between man and his fellow, thirdly of the relations of man in civil government, that is, of states and political communities, to each other.

---

\* This paper is a continuation of that in No. XVII. entitled "The Gods of the Nations when Christ appeared."

† An exception must be drawn in favour of Persia, where the original monotheism was preserved with more or less corruption.

Now, looking at this polytheistic idolatry simply as a fact, without for the moment any attempt to give a solution of it from authority, looking at it just as modern science would regard the facts of geology or astronomy, there is one thing, we may suppose, which it proves with a superabundance of evidence not found to belong to any other fact of history, and that is the intrinsic corruption of man as a moral being. That which in theological language is called the Fall of man is, apart from all revealed doctrine on the subject, brought in upon the mind with irresistible force by the mere enumeration of the gods which heathendom worshipped, and of the worship paid by it to them, a force which is indefinitely increased by every inquiry into the moral and religious state of man as he lived under this worship.

Now, then, let us consider what solution the Christian faith does give of this fact, which exists, be it remembered, independently of this solution, and would exist with all its force undiminished, if this were rejected.

1. The Christian faith, as a solution of this wonderful maze of polytheistic idolatry, with all its accompaniments and consequences, carries us back to the first father of the race, whose development we have been following in it. This, it says, is nothing else\* but the body of Adam carried out through thousands of years, the body of Adam fallen under a terrible captivity. Not only does the Christian faith set before us man as one race descended from one, but because he is this one race, descended from one, it represents him as having come into such a state. To understand this we must contemplate the original creation, the fall of man, and its consequences, in their several bearings on each other, which will then lead us on to the nature and mode of the restoration.

In speaking of the creation of man we may first consider the union of the soul and body simply by themselves; that is, in order to obtain a clear view of our subject, we may form to ourselves a purely ideal state of simple nature. Such a state would include two things, one positive, the other negative.† Positively, human nature in this condition would have all natural faculties in their essential perfection, and the assistance and providence of God naturally due to it: negatively, it would have nothing superadded to nature, nothing not due to it, whether evil or good, that is, neither sin on the one hand, and

---

\* Das Heidenthum ist ja eben nichts anderes als der gefallene nicht wiedergeborene Mensch im Grossen.—Möhler, Art. on Heathenism in *Historisch-politische Blätter*, p. 194.

† Suarez, de Gratia, Proleg. 4, cap. 1. sec. 3.

what follows sin, the guilt which entails punishment, nor on the other hand any gifts of grace, or perfections not due to nature.

Human nature, if created in such a state, would have no supernatural end ; its end would be to love God with a natural love, as the Author and Ruler of the world.

Of such a state it is requisite for our present purpose to say only two things further. The first, that it is not contrary to any attribute of God to have created human nature in such a state. The gift of eternal beatitude, arising from the vision of God, which such a creature would not have had for its end, is simply and absolutely a gratuitous gift of the divine bounty, which God is not bound to bestow on any creature as such. Secondly, God did not in fact so create man.

Going on from this state of simple nature we may consider another state in man, in which, beyond all his natural faculties,\* he would have a certain special perfection, consisting in the absence of immoderate concupiscence, or in the perfect subjection of the sensitive to the rational appetite, so that the inferior appetite should not be allowed to set itself in motion against the superior, or to anticipate reason. For human nature, regarded in itself as the union of a spirit and a body, is as it were divided in its natural affections, which tend in diverse directions, and thus totters, so to say, in its gait ; when therefore it receives an inward peace and harmony in its own proper faculties, it is said to be supplemented, or to receive its integrity.

Now it is much to be noted that this special gift of integrity would not be connatural to man, that is, not given to him by force of his nature itself. It is true indeed that as such a gift perfects nature in regard to all natural acts, and supplies a sort of natural deficiency arising out of the combination of a spiritual with a material substance, wherein a conflict is engendered, in such a sense it may be called natural : but strictly speaking it is a gift superadded to nature.

It must further be noted that this state of nature in its integrity, however high and beautiful, is not only entirely distinct from but of an inferior order to the state of human nature raised to the gift of Divine Sonship. Between human nature in this condition and human nature raised to the gift of sonship, there would be more than the difference† that with us exists between the kindly treated servant and the adopted son : for human nature in this integrity would still not by

---

\* *Ibid.* cap. 2, sec. 3.    † Kleutgen, *die Theologie der Vorzeit*, ii. p. 559.



virtue of it possess sanctifying grace, or, in consequence, have God and his vision for its supernatural end.

But, thirdly, it was not merely in this state that God created man, but in a state which not only included this, but had grace for its basis,\* that is to say, every perfection which it had, sprang out of this, that it was united to God by grace. This is a state of far superior order, absolutely gratuitous, and beyond anything which is due to nature. The first man, Adam, then, was not only a union of soul and body, not only did he possess this nature in its integrity, but he was created in grace, so that there was a union of the Holy Spirit with him, whereby he was exalted to the condition of a supernatural end and adopted Sonship, and in this union was rooted the integrity of his nature, and the supernatural power of so ruling all the lower faculties of his soul that the higher could mount undisturbedly to God : and certain other gifts over and above, such as immunity from error or deception, so long as he did not sin, immunity from even venial fault, immunity from death, and from all pain or sorrow. Such was the original condition which grace bestowed on human nature, wherein man had not only a supernatural end, but the power to attain it easily.†

Now, it is evident that man, by being created in grace, was raised to an astonishing height of dignity, to which not only his nature, but any created nature whatsoever had no claim. All that the justice and goodness of God required him to do in creating such a being as man of two substances, soul and body, was to bestow on the compound being so united such perfections as made the several substances complete in their own order. Such would be the ideal state of simple nature as delineated above. It was a gift beyond nature, such as nature in its first beginning could not claim, to bestow on it the integrity which in the second place we considered. But how far beyond this, passing it by an unmeasured chasm, was that dower of sonship rooted in sanctifying grace which God actually bestowed on His favoured child ? It is obvious at first sight that the divine gift here intended, being in Adam's actual creation the root of all which was over and above the natural faculties of body and soul in their union, was bestowed absolutely by the pure goodness of God, and therefore could be bestowed with such conditions attached to it as pleased the Giver. In all that is beyond the mere faculties and needs of nature—in forming which God's own being is a sort of rule to

---

\* Suarez, de Grat. Proleg. 4, cap. 5, sec. 3.

† Kleutgen, die Theologie der Vorzeit, vol. ii. 650.

Him—He is absolutely free to give as pleases Himself, to what degree He pleases, on what terms He pleases. What, then, were the conditions on which He invested Adam with the gift of Sonship, and created Him in grace as its foundation? He created him, not only as the individual Adam, but as the Head of his race, so that his race was summed up in him, and a unity was founded in him attaching his whole race as members to his body, in such manner that the supernatural gift of sonship bestowed on him was to descend from him by virtue of natural propagation to every member of that body, which thus became a supernatural race from a supernatural father. So absolute was this unity that the order maintained in the case of every other creature put under the dominion of the man so formed was not followed in his case. For whereas they were created with the difference of sex, each a male and a female, he was created alone, as the Head, and then she, by whose co-operation the race was to be continued, was formed out of him. It was not a second man who was so formed from the first, but one made with reference to him, in dependence on him, to be a help meet for him, not for herself, with an independent being, but for him. This formation of Eve from Adam, which has a meaning of unfathomable depth in the development of the race, is an essential part of the original design. “Therefore,” says Adam, speaking in an ecstasy sent upon him by God, the words of God, “this is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh.” First, the Eve so formed from him is one flesh with him; secondly, the race springing from both is one flesh likewise with him. The consequence intended by that one flesh was the transmission of that magnificent inheritance in which Adam was standing when he so spoke. In this he was Father and Head, for this created alone, then Eve built up from him, from whom afterwards was to issue their joint race. On the further condition of his personal obedience to God and fidelity to his grace, he held the whole supernatural gift of grace conferring sonship, both for himself and for his race: on these terms it was bestowed by the charter of God, the original Giver. Thus, the greatness of his Headship was visible in two things, the power of transmitting his quality of divine sonship to his race by propagation, and the dependence of that quality, in them as well as in himself, on his personal fidelity to God.

But the First Man, the Father and Head of the race, did not stand in his inheritance. He broke the divine command, and

lost the gift of sonship, and with it all the prerogatives attendant on that gift, which were above nature and rooted in grace, and which the eminent goodness of God had bestowed upon him: and by the terms of the original charter lost the gift, not only for himself, but for his race. But he did not, therefore, destroy that relation between the Head and the Race, which was part of the original foundation of God. This continued; but, whereas it had been intended to communicate the blessing of adoption, it now served to communicate the demerit of adoption lost, the guilt, and with it the punishment incurred by that loss. This is the original sin, inherited by the members of Adam's body.

Let us try to determine as accurately as we can the position into which Adam and his race fell.

Did, then, Adam simply lose with the forfeiture of sanctifying grace the gift of sonship, the supernatural inheritance, all which God had bestowed on him beyond that ideal state of pure nature which we described in the first instance? God, we said, might have created man originally in this condition, and man, so created, that is, in virtue of this creation, would not have been under any sin, nor exposed to the anger of God. Did man, by Adam's sin, fall back into it? Not so. His state after his fall differed from such a state of pure nature in that he had upon him the guilt of lost adoption, of adoption lost by the first Adam's fault, and in proportion to the greatness of the loss, and the gratuitousness of the gift originally bestowed, was the anger with which on the donor's part the loss was regarded. How would a king, a man like ourselves, regard one whom he had raised out of the dust to be his adopted child, and who had been unfaithful to the parent who had so chosen him with more than natural affection? Such an anger we can indeed understand when felt against the person sinning; but we fail to enter into it as resting on the race, because the secret tie which binds the head and the race into one is not discerned by us; because, too, the greatness of the divine majesty, the awfulness of His sovereignty, and the wrath of that majesty slighted are feebly appreciated by us. But this image may at least give us some notion of the nature of that divine anger which pressed upon Adam and his race after the fall. Not only, therefore, was the gift of sonship, and the prerogatives attending it withdrawn, but this withdrawal was a punishment, which their absence in the presumed case of an original state of simple nature would not have been. Thus death was a punishment to Adam and his race; the body's weakness and disease, the soul's sorrows and pains, the disobedience of the inferior appetites to the reason, the resistance

of the reason to the law of God, were all punishments, and a remarkable point of the punishment is to be seen in this. Adam, as the head of his race, was in virtue of natural propagation to have bestowed on the children of his flesh, the members of his body, his own supernatural inheritance. Thus a singular honour was conferred on the fatherhood of Adam. But now when, in virtue of this natural propagation, he, continuing to be the head of his race, transmitted to it the guilt of adoption lost instead of the blessing of adoption conferred, a peculiar shame was set by God upon this fatherhood of Adam, and upon all the circumstances attending it: so that henceforth in the disinherited race the bride veiled her head, and the act of being a father became an act of shame.

The condition, therefore, of Adam and his posterity after his fall differed from the condition which would have been that of simple nature by the whole extent of the guilt incurred by the nature in its fall from sonship.

And herein lies one peculiarity, and one strangely distressing condition of his state, in that, while he lost by the fall the grace in which, as an indwelling gift, his whole supernatural state had been rooted, he yet did not lose that condition of being formed and intended for a supernatural end which grace alone could enable him to attain. For the supernatural vision and love of God he had been created, and in his fall he did not sink to be merely a natural man; but his original end was still held out before him as that which he might reach supported by that grace the aids of which were in a different measure promised to him in order to lead a life of penance, and as the earnest of a future restoration.

This, however, is far from being a complete statement of his case, and we must go back to the circumstances of his fall in order to add that further still more peculiar and remarkable condition which, added to the one just described, made up the whole of his fall.

Adam had not disobeyed the divine command, and so broken the covenant of his sonship by the simple promptings of his own will. Another had intervened: had suggested to the woman doubts against her Maker and Father. She had yielded to these doubts, and disobeyed, and then Adam had suffered himself to be drawn with her in her disobedience. Who was this other? He was the prince and leader of spirits created good, but fallen into enmity with God. Thus the favourite son of God had listened to the persuasion of God's chief enemy, and his fall from sonship had been, by the judgment of the offended Parent, not a simple fall from his supernatural estate, but a fall likewise into servitude to that

enemy. This servitude also, with the guilt of the nature in which he had sinned, Adam transmitted to the members of his body in and by their nature. Adam with his race was the captive taken in war by the enemy of God, and the life which he was allowed to live had the condition of this servitude impressed on it, with this alleviation only, that the assistance of the divine grace offered to him by the mercy of God in his state of penance could protect those who accepted it from the effects of this servitude, and ultimately deliver them.

Here, then, is the condition of Adam's posterity in consequence of his fall; members of a Head who had broken his allegiance to his Creator and Father, and so inheriting with their nature the disinherited state into which he had cast himself; captives, moreover, of that powerful spirit, God's antagonist, who had tempted Adam, seduced him, and led him to his fall.

Now, the heathenism which we have been contemplating is the carrying out in time and space of this body of Adam in those who, by their personal fault, fell away from the aids of grace which were accorded to man after his fall—aids given first to Adam for the whole race, and then renewed to Noah for the whole race; and the false worship, so blent and mingled with heathenism, which seemed as if it were the soul of its body, is the sign and stamp of that captivity to the evil spirit which the first man's sin inaugurated.

How powerful was the bond between Adam and his race, how great and influential the headship which the Divine choice had vested in him, we see in that mysterious transmission of guilt which passed from him to his children. And it must be expressly noted that it was not a transmission of punishment alone. Rather, the divine justice cannot punish where there is no guilt; and as in this case Adam's fall, and that of his posterity with him was not merely a loss but a punishment, so it had the special nature of guilt, not only in him but in his posterity, and was a sin both of the person and of the nature in him, of the nature only in them. We see the force and range of the divine endowment of Adam here, though it be in the tenacity of the calamity which ensued to his race; but it must be remembered that such in this respect as the punishment was, the blessing would have been. Adam was created both an individual and a race. In him were two things—the single man and the head; but of these two things the headship was peculiar to himself, while such as the individual Adam was, his race was to be. He had it in his power to break the covenant of his sonship with God, but not the tie between himself and his race.

And this sheds a light upon the darkest part of that terrible picture which collected heathenism presents to us. Man, as a social animal, is incessant in his action on his fellow-man; the parent and the family form the child; the companion and the neighbourhood lead forth the child into manhood. This work is perpetually going on in all its parts, and society is the joint result. When, therefore, we see this society once fallen into the possession of a false worship, which perverts the very foundations of morality, and instils deadly error into the child with the mother's milk, no thoughtful mind can gaze without horror upon beings involved in such a maze,\* yet intended for an eternal duration. Man's nature, as a race, seems turned against him; and in addition to the guilt under which each individual of the race is born, and the nature which each inherits, wherein the internal harmony of peace is broken, and neither the appetites obey the reason nor the reason is obedient to God, comes the force of habit, of education, of culture, of companionship, of man's business and leisure, his play and his earnest, the force of his language, the expression of his thoughts upon himself and others, the whole force, in fact, of man's social being when it is put under possession of an evil power, man's adversary. But this social nature was to have been to him the means of the greatest good. As by his natural descent from Adam unfallen would have come the grace of sonship, so the whole brotherhood of those who shared that gift would have helped and supported each in the maintenance of it. The human family would have had a beauty and a unity of its own as such; an order and a lustre would have rested on the whole body, confirming each member in the possession of his own particular gift. The concatenation of evil in the corrupt society is the most striking contrast to the fellowship of good in the upright; and while it is distinct from that guilt which descends to man as the sin of his nature, yet springs like it from the original constitution of that nature as a race. It is the invasion of evil upon good carried to its utmost point, wherein we discern most plainly "the prince of this world" wielding "that power of darkness" by which the Apostle described the whole state of the world, out of which these nations, which made the empire of Augustus, were a part.

We have thus contemplated four distinct pictures. The first of these was human nature bare and naked by itself, a merely ideal view of man, as a being compounded of soul and

---

\* This is called by S. Peter 1 i. 18—*ἡ ματαιὰ ἀναστροφή πατροπαράδοτος*.



body, each possessing only the faculties which belong to them as spiritual and corporeal natures, the result of which is a substantial union, because the spiritual substance becomes the form of the corporeal, not by making the body, when already animated by another principle, to participate of spiritual life, but by becoming itself the principle first animating it. And we set forth this condition of human nature in order to throw light upon our second picture—the first man as he was actually created, possessing, as a gift superadded by the purest divine bounty to this his natural constitution, a divine sonship founded in grace ; which transcendant union of the Holy Spirit with his soul kept the soul with all its faculties in a loving obedience to God, and the body in obedience to the soul ; and added even to this state the further gratuitous prerogatives of immunity from error, fault, pain, distress, and death. Our third picture was man in this same state, but constituted besides by the divine will, whose good pleasure was the sole source of all this state of sonship, to be father of a race like to himself, receiving from him, with its natural generation, the transmitted gift of sonship ; that is, from our view of him as an individual person we went on to consider him as the head of a body—the root of a tree. Fourthly, we have looked on the same man stripped by a fault, personal to himself but natural to his race, of this divine sonship—reduced to a state like that which the first would have been, but altered from it by two grave conditions, one of guilt lying on himself and his race on account of this gratuitous gift of sonship lost, another of captivity to that enemy of his Creator and Father who had seduced him to fall. And this picture included in it the double effect of guilt transmitted through a whole race from its head and father, and of the personal sins of each individual of the race : which, moreover, had a tendency to be perpetually heightened by the social nature of man—that part of his original condition which, as it would have supported his highest good in the state of innocence, so came to make his corruption intense and more complicated in the state of fall. It has not been our purpose in this sketch to dwell upon those who, like Adam himself after his fall, accepted the divine assistance offered to them, and the promise of a future Restorer, and who, living a life of penance, kept their faith in God. Such an assistance was offered not only to Adam but to his whole race, and such a line of men there always was ; of whom Abel was the type in the world before the flood ; Noah after the flood, as the second father of the whole race ; Abraham, the friend of God and father of the faithful, in whose son Isaac a people was to be formed, which, as the

nations in their apostacy fell more and more away from the faith and knowledge of the true God, should maintain still the seed of promise out of which the Restorer should spring. But before that Restorer came, the heathenism—of which we have been speaking in the former paper, and of which we have been giving the solution above—was in possession of all but the whole earth, and the captivity of man to his spiritual foe, on account of which that foe is called “the Ruler” and “the God” “of this world,” which is said “to lie in the malignant one,” was all but universal. This universality denoted that the fullness of the time\* marked out in the providence of God was come.

For Adam, in his first creation, and in the splendour of that robe of sonship† in which he was invested, had been the figure of One to come: his figure as an individual person, his figure as father and head of a race, his figure, likewise, when the race itself is viewed as summed up in one, as one body. Let us take each of these in their order.

What was the counterpart of Adam, as an individual person, in the new creation? It was the Eternal Son Himself assuming a human soul and body, and bearing our nature in His divine personality. Over against the creature invested with sonship stood the uncreated Son, invested with a created nature. For the grace of the Holy Spirit given by measure, and depending for its continuance on the obedience of the creature, was the Fountain of Grace Himself ruling the creature by a union indefeasible and eternal; for grace communicated grace immanent in its source. For the son gratuitously adopted was the Son by nature making, by an inconceivable grace, the created nature assumed to be that not of the adopted but of the natural Son. In a word, the figure was man united to God; the counterpart, the God-man.

What, again, is Adam’s counterpart as Father and Head of his race? It was human nature itself, which the Word of God espoused in the bridal-chamber of the Virginal Womb, and so is become the Second Adam, the Father of a new race, the Head of a mystical Body, which corresponds to Adam’s original Headship, but as far transcends it as the grace of the Incarnate Word transcends the grace bestowed on the first man. As Adam, had he stood in his original state of son, would have transmitted the gift of a like sonship to his whole race—as, falling, he did actually transmit to that race the

---

\* Gal. iv. 4—τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου.

† τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος—Rom. v. 14. *Forma futuri e contrario Christus ostenditur.*—S. Aug. tom. 10, 1335.

guilt of adoption lost, so the Second Adam, out of His own uncreated Sonship, but through the nature which He had assumed, bestowed the dower of adopted sons and the gift of justice on his race. From the one there was punishment generating through the flesh ; \* from the other, grace regenerating through the Spirit. From the one, nature stripped and wounded, yet still bound to its head by an indissoluble tie ; by the other, the Spirit of the Head, the Spirit of Truth, Charity, Unity, and Sanctity, ruling his Body and animating it, as the natural soul animates the natural body. Precisely where the mystery was darkest, and the misery greatest, the divine grace is most conspicuous, and the divine power most triumphant. The very point which brings out Adam's connection with his race has an exact counterpart in Christ's Headship of His people, and an inscrutable judgment serves to illustrate an unspeakable gift. In exact accordance with the doctrine that the sin of Adam is man's sin, and the guilt of Adam man's guilt, is that boundless and unimaginable grace that the Incarnate Word did not merely assume an individual human nature, but espoused in that assumption the whole nature ; that on the cross He paid the debt of the whole nature, whether for original or actual sin ; that His resurrection is our collective justification ; that the gift of sonship is bestowed on men not as individual persons, but as members of His Body, before they have personally merited anything, just as the guilt came on them, as members of Adam, before they demerited anything personally. Exactly where the obscurity of the fall was the deepest, the light of the restoration is brightest ; and where the sentence was most severe, the grace most wonderful. But to deny the first Adam would entail the loss of the Second, and he who declines the inheritance of the father stripped and wounded cannot enter into the Body of the Word made flesh.

But, thirdly, as in that terrible corruption of heathenism, wherein immorality was based on false worship, we saw the body of Adam run out through time and space into the most afflicting form which evil can assume in the individual and social life of man, so in that Body which is ruled by the Divine Headship we see the counterpart, the triumph of grace, individual man taken out of that state of fallen nature, and invested with a membership answering to the dignity of the

---

\* Adam unus est, in quo omnes peccaverunt, quia non solum ejus imitatio peccatores facit, sed per carnem generans poena : Christus unus est, in quo omnes justificentur, quia non solum ejus imitatio justos facit, sed per spiritum regenerans gratia. —S. Aug., tom. 10, p. 12, c.

Head. The one great Christian people, the Kingdom of Christ, stands over against that kingdom of violence, disorder, impurity, and false worship. As there is a unity of the fallen Adam, a force of evil which impact only gives, so much more is there a unity of the Second Adam which is not a collection of individuals but a Body with its Head. The first unity consists in the reasonable soul, informing the flesh which was moulded once for all from the clay and descended to the whole race; and the race so descending was polluted by a common guilt, on which, as an ever fertile root, grew the whole trunk of man's personal sins, of falsehood, enmity, corruption of morals, division, having the common quality of egotism. The second unity consists in the Holy Spirit of the Head communicated to the soul and body of the faithful people, both being restored by that grace of which truth and charity, unity and sanctity are the tokens, the full virtue being planted in the cross of the Head, and from the cross diffusing itself to His Body.

II. And so we are brought again to Him who stood before Pilate to make the good confession, and who declared that the cause of His coming into the world was to bear witness to the truth. In what form was that witness to be made, and how was it to be efficacious? This is the point which we have now to illustrate. Adam's disobedience was a single act, the power of which, springing out of his headship, extended through the whole line of his race; through the consequences of this act the truth was obscured to them, and human life involved in manifold error. What was that action on the part of Christ, the purpose, as He declares, of his incarnation, which had an equally enduring effect? If the guilt communicated was not transitory, then should the corresponding grace be perpetual. And how was it so? The Son of God, as the Head of his race, does not stand at disadvantage with Adam, but rather, we are told, his grace is superabundant in its results over the other's sin: and He Himself declared that He had completely finished the work given Him to do. But here He describes this work to be the bearing witness to the truth. For, indeed, it was worthy of the eternal wisdom to clothe Himself in flesh \* in order that truth, the good of the intellect, and the end of the whole universe, might stand forth revealed to His rational creatures: and He who made all things in truth, would Himself restore truth, when it had been obscured by the traducer.

---

\* S. Thomas, *Summa contra Gentiles*, l. 1, c. 1.

Let us take first the character which He acknowledged and claimed before Pilate: his character of King, and the kingdom in which it is exercised.

The Person of Christ, as that of the eternal Word, is the Truth itself. But he has assumed a body, and in that body He declares that He is a king, and that the exercise of His royalty is the bearing witness to the truth.\* His words, therefore, indicate no less than the creation of a kingdom to which the truth should be the principle of subsistence. But what in the material or temporal kingdom is that by force of which it subsists? Plainly power. A kingdom may be larger or smaller in population, wealth, extent, stronger or weaker in the quality of its people, but as long as it retains in itself that in which power culminates, sovereignty, it will be a kingdom. If this power departs from it, if it falls into subjection to a foreign authority, or, if its own subjects successfully rebel against its power, it ceases to be. In the kingdom, therefore, of which Christ speaks the maintenance of truth corresponds to what the maintenance of power is in a material kingdom.

But power in the material kingdom moves men to the natural end of society; it preserves order, administers justice, allows and assists all natural forces to develop themselves, and it must be in its supreme exercise one and indisputable: that is, it culminates in sovereignty. So in the spiritual kingdom truth, the corresponding power, moves men to the supernatural end, and truth culminates in infallibility. But where is this power seated, and how does the King wield it?

The same who here calls Himself King and declares it to be the function of His royalty to bear witness to the truth, in describing elsewhere the very creation of His kingdom says to His apostles, "You shall receive power by the Holy Ghost coming upon you," bidding them also to remain in Jerusalem "until they were endued with power from on high."† But a few hours before that scene in the hall of Pilate He had told them also that He would send them the Spirit of Truth, who should abide with them for ever, and should lead them into all truth. He creates, therefore, the kingdom of the truth by sending down the Spirit of the Truth to dwell for ever with these to whom he is sent; and this Spirit of the Truth is His own Spirit, whom He Himself will send as the token of His ascension and session; the Spirit who dwelt in the Body which He had assumed, and in which He spoke before Pilate, should

\* John xviii. 37. Thou sayest, that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, to bear witness unto the truth.

† Acts i. 8; Luke xxiv. 49.

be sent by Him when that Body had taken its place at the right hand of God, should invest with his own power those to whom He was sent, and should never cease to be with them in his character of the Spirit of Truth. Here, then, is that power in the kingdom of the Truth which enables it to bear a true and a perpetual witness. It is the power of the King, for it is His Spirit: it is the power of the kingdom, for it remains in it, is throned in it, and makes it to be what it is.

But to create a kingdom of the truth, and to bear perpetual witness in that kingdom to the truth is not only to state what is true. These expressions mark out an organization in and by means of which truth is perpetuated. And further, the spirit in man is both reason and will; and that man may act, the intellect which has truth for its object must work on the will which has good for its object. And so the witness which our Lord speaks of is that action of the truth upon the will which produces a life in accordance with it: it is truth not left to itself, but supported by grace. This power of the Spirit of Truth is therefore double, as intended to work on the two powers of the soul, the reason and the will: it is the double gift of Truth and Grace; as He is the Spirit of Grace no less than the Spirit of Truth, and all grace is His immediate gift.

Thus the Word made flesh being full of Truth and Grace from His own Person communicated that Truth and Grace as the power which should form His kingdom for ever, abide in it, and constitute its being a kingdom; the gift of truth and grace being the very presence of His own Spirit, who took possession of His kingdom on the day of Pentecost and holds it for ever.

This whole possession of Truth and Grace dwelling in a visible body is the work of the eternal Word, who assumed a body for that purpose. It is the counter-creation to the kingdom of falsehood which commenced with the sin of the first man believing a falsehood against his maker, and which spread itself with his lineage into all lands.\* And as in the natural creation He not only created but maintained—for He did not make his creatures and then depart from them, but from that time they exist in him—so in the supernatural the act of maintaining is equivalent to the act of creating, it is a continued creation. As the guilt had a force which was fruitful, which continued and propagated itself, and produced a widespread reign of falsehood, how much more should that mighty and

---

\* See S. Aug. tom. 4, 1039 e. Ipse ergo Adam, &c.



astonishing grace of a Divine Person assuming a created nature be fruitful, continue, and propagate itself in the maintenance of a visible kingdom, whose distinctive character and its very life should be the possession and communication of the truth. Should the Creator of man in his greatest work be less powerful than his seduced creature in his fall? and if the fall, pregnant with falsehood, bore fruit through ages in a whole race, should not the recovery likewise have its visible dominion, and stand over against the ruin as the kingdom of truth?

It is as King ruling in the kingdom of truth that the Divine Word incarnate redeems man from captivity, which began in a revolt from the truth, and in becoming subject to falsehood. All who are outside of His kingdom lie in this captivity; \* the life which He gave voluntarily is the price paid for their liberation; and as age after age, so long as the natural body of Adam lasts, the captivity endures, so age after age the liberation takes effect by entering into his kingdom. And this is the most general name, the name of predilection, which both in prophecy marked the time of Messiah the King, and was announced by His precursor, and taken by our Lord to indicate His having come. The eternal duration of this kingdom may be said to be the substance of all prophecy, and it was precisely in the interpretation of a vision describing under the image of a great statue the four world-kingdoms, that is, the whole structure, course, and issue of the heathenism which we have been contemplating, that Daniel contrasts these kingdoms with another. "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be delivered to another people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and shall stand itself for ever." As King in this kingdom through all the generations of men from the moment that He stood in Pilate's hall until He comes to judge the world our Lord bears witness to the truth, his witness and his royalty being contemporaneous and conterminous to each other.

---

\* οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐσμέν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ὅλος ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται· οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἦκει, καὶ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν διάνοιαν ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀληθινόν· καὶ ἐσμέν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ.— 1 Jo. v. 19. Compare the Lord's Prayer, ρῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Matt. vi. 13, and Joh. xvii. 14-15—ἐγὼ δέδωκα αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον σου, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐμίσησεν αὐτούς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, καθὼς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἀρῇς αὐτούς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἵνα τηρησῇς αὐτούς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

This perpetual possession and announcement of the truth is indicated by another image which is of constant recurrence\* wherein Christ is the Inhabitant, his people the Inhabited, while both are the House or Temple, for that in which God dwells is at once his House and Temple. Thus Moses is said to have been "faithful in all his house as a servant, but Christ as a Son over his own house, whose house are we." Here the King who bears witness to the truth is the God who sanctifies the faithful people by dwelling in them and building them in the truth. It is not merely the individual believer, but the whole mass of the faithful which grows up to be a holy temple; and the ever-abiding Spirit of truth, whose presence is the guarantee of truth, is the equally abiding Spirit of sanctity, whose presence imparts holiness. The Son dwells in his own house by his Spirit for ever: as He ceases not to be incarnate, He ceases not to dwell in his house, and could falsehood be worshipped in his temple, it would cease to be his. That was the work of heathenism, when a false spirit had caused error to be worshipped for truth; the specific victory of the Word incarnate was to set up a temple in which the truth should be worshipped for ever, "the inhabitation of God in the Spirit." But living stones make up this temple, that is, individual spirits, endued with their own reason and will, yet no less fitted in and cemented together by His grace, and so forming a structure which has an organic unity of its own, being the House and Temple of One. It is in virtue of this inhabitation that the Church is termed the House of God, the pillar and ground of the truth, inasmuch as it contains, as between walls,† the faith and its announcement and proclamation, that is, the law of the King of Truth declared by his heralds. "We speculate," says S. Augustine, "that we may attain to vision; yet even the most studious speculation would fall into error unless the Lord inhabited the Church herself that now is."‡ And, again, "In earthly possessions a benefit is given to the proprietor when he is given possession; not so is the possession which is the Church. The benefit here lies in being possessed by such a one."—"Christ's Body is both Temple, and House, and City, and

---

\* Heb. iii. 1-6; Ephes. ii. 19-22; 1 Cor. iii. 9, 10-15; 2 Cor. vi. 16; 1 Peter ii. 4-5.

† Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ συνέχον τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα. — S. Chrys. in loco. Compare S. Irenæ, Lib. i. c. 10. Τοῦτο τὸ κήρυγμα παρειληφυῖα, καὶ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν, ὡς προέφαιμεν, ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καίπερ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διεσπαρμένη, ἐπιμελῶς φυλάσσει, ὡς ἓνα οἶκον οἰκοῦσα.

‡ S. Aug. in Ps. 9, tom. c. iv., 51.

He who is Head of the Body is Inhabiter of the House, and Sanctifier of the Temple, and King of the City.—What can we say more acceptable to him than this, Possess us? ”\*

Again, to take another image, which is the greatest of realities. What a wonderful production of divine skill is the structure of the human body! Even its outward beauty is such as to sway our feelings with a force which reason has at times a hard combat to overcome, so keen is the delight which it conveys. But the inward distribution of its parts is so marvellous that those who have spent their lives in the study of its anatomy can find in a single member, for instance, in the hand, enough out of which to fill a volume with the wise adaptation of means to ends which it reveals. There are parts of it the structure of which is so minute and subtle that the most persevering science has not yet attained fully to unravel their use. In all this arrangement of nerves and muscles, machines of every sort, meeting all manner of difficulties, and supplying all kinds of uses, what an endless storehouse of wisdom and forethought. And all these are permeated by a common life, which binds every part, whatever its several importance, into one whole, and all these, in the state of health, work together with so perfect an ease that the living actor, the bearer of so marvellous a structure, is unconscious of an effort, and exults in the life so simple and yet so manifold poured out on such a multitude of members, a life so tender that the smallest prick is felt over the whole body, and yet so strong that a wound may transfix the whole structure leaving the life untouched. And, in addition to this physical marvel, the incorporeal mind, which has its seat in this material structure, and whose presence is itself its life, rules like an absolute monarch with undisputed sway over his whole dominion, so that the least movement of volition carries with it a willing obedience in the whole frame, and for it instantaneously the eye gazes, the ear listens, the tongue speaks, the feet walk, the hands work, and the brain feels with an incomparable unity. The marvel of the body is that things so many and various by the rule of the artificer impressed upon them are yet one, concur to one end, and produce one whole, from which no part can be taken, and to which none can be added without injury, the least and the greatest replete with one life, which so entirely belongs to the whole body that what is severed from the body at once dies. “Now, as the body is one, and has many members, but all the members of this one body, being many, are one

---

\* S. Aug. in Ps. 131, tom. iv. 1473.

body, so also," says S. Paul, "is Christ," giving the name of the Head to the whole Body. What the human head is to its own body that our Lord is to His Church. Perhaps no other image in the whole realm of nature would convey with such force the three relations\* which constitute spiritual headship, an inseparable union, by which the head and the body form one whole, an unceasing government, including every sort of provision and care, and a perpetual influx of grace. This is on the part the head, while perhaps no other image but this could equally convey the conjunction of many different members with various functions, whose union makes the structure, and whose unity is something entirely distinct from that which all the parts in their several state, or even in their collocation and arrangement, make up, for it is the life which makes them one. Thus it is an unfathomed depth of doctrine, which is conveyed in the words, "God gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church who is His Body, the fullness of Him who fills all things in all." For though no language could exhaust or duly exhibit the meaning of the kingdom or the temple in which the abiding work of our Lord is indicated, we have in this title yet more strikingly portrayed the intimate union and common life of His people with Christ, and his tender affection for them, since the King of Truth who redeems and the God of Truth who sanctifies is at the same time the Head who by his own Spirit of the truth rules and vivifies His own Body. If it be possible to dissociate the idea of the King from his kingdom, or that of God from the temple of living souls in whom He is worshipped, and whose worship of Him makes them one, yet in the human frame to dis sever the head from the body is to destroy the propriety of both terms, and it is as a whole human body that the apostle represents Christ and His people to us.

Yet, as if this was not enough, S. Paul goes on to delineate Him as the Bridegroom whose love after redeeming sanctifies one who shall be His bride for ever, one who obeys Him with the fidelity of conjugal love, one whose preservation of His faith unstained is not the dry fulfilment of a command, but the prompting of wedded affection. The image seems chosen to convey intensity of love, first on the part of the Bridegroom as originating it, and then on the part of the Bride as responding to it. But no less does the unity of person in the Bride, given by S. John as well as by S. Paul, indicate in the Church something quite distinct from the individuals who

---

\* Petavius on the Headship of Christ.

compose her. For she is the pattern of the faithful wife in that she is subject to Christ ; and in these words a fact is stated,\* a fact without limit of place or time, which therefore marks that she who is so described can never at any time be separated from the fidelity and love due from her to her Head and Husband. And this is not true of the individual souls belonging to her, for they, having been once faithful members of the body, may fall away and be finally lost. The Bride alone is subject to Christ with a never-failing subjection. And He on His part loves her as His own flesh, a union of the two loves of the Head for the Body, and of the Bridegroom for the Bride, which is true with regard to Him of the Church alone, since individuals within her He may cast off, but her alone He cherishes and fosters for ever. It is indefectible union and unbroken charity with Him which her quality of Bride conveys.

And out of this wedded union by that great sacrament concerning Christ and the Church, of which in the same passage S. Paul speaks, that they two shall be one flesh, springs the whole race, in the generation of whom is most completely verified his title of the Second Adam. From the womb of the Church, become from a Bride the Mother of all living, the Father of the age to come bears that chosen race, and royal priesthood, and holy nation, and purchased people. And here we see expressed with great force the truth that all who belong to the Father's supernatural race must come by the Mother. Her office of parent is here set forth ; as her fidelity and intense affection shine in the title of the Bride, as her union, submission, and unfailing reception of life in her title of Body, so in the title of Mother all the saved are borne to Christ by her, as S. Cyprian† drew the conclusion, " He cannot have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother."

In all this we see the five‡ great loves first shown by God to man, then returned by man to God ; the love of the Saviour, redeeming captives, and out of these forming His kingdom ; the love of the friend, who is God, sanctifying those whom He redeems into one temple ; the love which He has implanted in man for self-preservation, since that which He so redeems and sanctifies He has made His own body ; the love which He has given to the bridegroom for the bride, since it is the Bride of

\* Passaglia, de Ecclesia.

† S. Cyprian, de Unitate, 5.

‡ All these five relations between Christ and the Church are mentioned in one passage of S. Paul, Ephes. v. 22-33.

the Lamb who is so adorned; and the love of the Father for his race, since it is his wife who bears every child to him. Why is the whole force of human language exhausted, and the whole strength of the several human affections accumulated in this manner? It is to express the super-eminent work of God made flesh, who, when He took a human body, created in correspondence to it that among men and out of men in which the virtue of His Incarnation is stored up, the mystical Kingdom, Temple, Body, Bride, and Mother. No one of these titles could convey the full riches of his work, or the variously wrought splendour of his wisdom, which the angels desire to look into; therefore He searched through human nature and society in all its depth and height for images whose union might express a work so unexampled and unique. Rather, it is truer to say that these natural affections themselves, the gift of that most bountiful giver, were created by Him originally to be types, foreshadowings, and partial copies of that more excellent supernatural love which He had decreed to show to man, since first of all things in the order of the Divine design must the Incarnation have been. The whole structure of the family, and the affections which it contains, must spring out of this root, for nature was anticipated by grace in man's creation, and must ever have been subordinate to it. And now, when the full time of grace is come, these titles of things which by His mercy have lasted through the fall, serve to illustrate the greatness of the restoration. For this, which has many names, all precious and dear, is but one creation, having the manifold qualities of redemption and sanctification, of organic unity in one body, wherein many members conspire to a corporate life, which life itself is charity, and in which is the production of the holy race. As we gaze on the Kingdom, Temple, Body, Spouse, and Family one seems to melt and change into the other. The Kingdom is deepened and enlarged by the thought that the King is the eternal Truth who is worshipped therein; and the worship passes on into the love of the Incarnate God for the members of His own Body, whom He first saves, then fosters and cherishes as His own flesh: and here again is blended that tenderest love of the Bridegroom for the bride, which further issues into the crowning love of the Father for His race. The mode of the salvation seems to spring from the nature of God Himself, since all paternity in heaven and earth springs from that whereby He is Father of the only-begotten Son, who, descending from heaven with the love of the Bridegroom for the bride, binds together in sonship derived from his own the members of His body, the bride of His heart, the subjects of



His kingdom, who are built up as living stones into that unimaginable temple raised in the unity of worshipping hearts to the ever-blessed Trinity. To this grows out, as the fulness of Him who fills all in all, that body of the Second Adam, of which in the body of the first Adam He had Himself deposited the germ.

When the angel described to the Blessed Virgin herself that miracle of miracles which was to take place in her, the assumption of human flesh by the Son of God, he used these terms: 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. When the Son of God, at the moment of His ascension, declared to His Apostles the creation of His mystical body, by using similar words He referred them back to His own conception: "You shall receive power, the Holy Ghost coming upon you:" having already on the day of His Resurrection told them, "I send the promise of my Father upon you, but wait you in the city until you be indued with power from on high."\* Our Lord Himself thus suggests to us the remarkable parallel between the formation of His natural and His mystical body. He who framed the one and the other is the same, the Holy Ghost: the Head precedes, the Body follows; because of the first descent that Holy Thing which was to be born should be called the Son of God; because of the second, "You shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and to the farthest part of the earth;" and this is said in answer to their question whether He would then restore the kingdom to Israel: that is, the second descent of the Holy Ghost forms the kingdom whose witness to Christ is perpetual; forms the body with which and in which He will be for ever by this power of His Spirit dwelling in it to the end of the world. We have, therefore, here all the various functions and qualities which, under the five great titles of Kingdom, Temple, Body, Spouse, and Mother, delineate His Church, gathered up into that unity which comprehends them all, and from which, as a source, they all flow, "The Power of the Holy Ghost coming upon men."† This creation is as absolutely His, and His alone, as the forming of our Lord's own Body in the Virginal Womb; it is the sequel of it; the fulfilment among men of those divine purposes for which God became Incarnate; in

---

\* Luke i. 35—Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σε, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι. Acts i. 8 —λήψεσθε δύναμιν, ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς. Luke xxiv. 49—ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε δύναμιν ἐξ ὕψους.

† The Church is so called by S. Augustine.

one word, the Body of the Head perpetually quickened by His Spirit. And here we may remark those striking resemblances between the natural and mystical Body which this "power of the Holy Ghost," the former of them both, indicates. For in the first the manhood\* cannot be severed from the Person of the Word, nor in the second can the body of the Church be severed from Christ the Head, and His Spirit. Secondly, in the first the Person of the Word and His manhood make one Christ, and in the second Christ the Head and the Church the Body make one complete Body. Thirdly, in the first the manhood has its own will, but through union with the Godhead is impeccable and indefeasible; and in the second the Body of the Church, though possessing its own liberty, is so ruled by Christ and guided by His Spirit, that it cannot fail in truth or in charity. Fourthly, in the first there is an influx of celestial gifts from the Person of the Word into the manhood, and in the second there is a like influx from Christ the Head into His Body, the Church, so that he who hears the Church hears Christ, and he who persecutes the Church, as Saul before the gate of Damascus, persecutes Christ. Fifthly, in the first the Head, through the manhood as His instrument, fulfilled all the economy of redemption, dwelt among men, taught them, redeemed them, bestowed on them the gifts of holiness and the friendship of God; and in the second, what He began in His manhood He continues through the Church as His own Body,† and bestows on men what He merited in His flesh, showing in and by the Church His presence among men, teaching them holiness, preserving them from error, and leading them to the eternal inheritance.

It is also by this one "power of the Holy Ghost coming upon men" that we learn how the Head and the Body make one Christ. As in the human frame the presence of the soul gives it life and unity, binding together every member by that secret indivisible force, from the least to the greatest, from the heart and brain to the minutest portion of the outward skin,

---

\* These five are taken from Passaglia, de Ecclesia, lib. 1, cap. 3, p. 34-5.

† Compare S. Athanasius cont. Arian. de Incarn. p. 877, c. —καὶ ὅταν λέγῃ ὁ Πέτρος, ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι καὶ Κύριον καὶ Χριστὸν αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε, οὐ περὶ τῆς Θεότητος αὐτοῦ λέγει, ὅτι καὶ Κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ Χριστὸν ἐποίησεν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος αὐτοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ κυριεύουσα καὶ βασιλεύουσα, μετὰ τὸ αὐτὸν σταυρωθῆναι· καὶ χριόμενη εἰς βασιλειαν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα συμβασιλεύσῃ αὐτῷ, τῷ δι' αὐτὴν ἑαυτὸν ἑκένωσαντι, καὶ ἀναλαβόντι αὐτὴν διὰ τῆς δουλικῆς μορφῆς.

so in this divine Body, which makes the whole Christ, it is the presence of the Holy Ghost, as of the soul, which gives it unity and life. The conclusion was drawn by a great Saint, and no less great a genius, fourteen hundred years ago. These are S. Augustine's words:—"Our spirit by which every man lives is called the soul; our spirit by which each several man lives is called the soul; and you see what the soul does in the body. It quickens all the limbs: through the eyes it sees, through the ears it hears, through the nostrils smells, through the tongue speaks, through the hands works, through the feet walks; it is present at once in all the limbs that they may live; life it gives to all, their functions to each. The eye does not hear, nor the ear nor the tongue see, nor the ear nor the eye speak, but both live; the functions are diverse, the life common. So is the Church of God. In some saints it works miracles; in others gives voice to the truth; in others, again, maintains the virginal life; in others keeps conjugal fidelity: in these one thing, in those another; each have their proper work, but all alike live. Now, what the soul is to the human body, that is the Holy Spirit to the body of Christ, which is the Church: what the soul does in all the limbs of an individual body, that does the Holy Spirit in the whole Church. But see what you have to avoid, what to observe, and what to fear. It happens that, in the human body, or in any other body, some member may be cut off, hand, finger, or foot. Does the soul follow it when cut off? As long as it was in the body it lived: when cut off, it loses life. So, too, the Christian man is a Catholic while he lives in the body; when cut off, he becomes a heretic: the Spirit does not follow the amputated limb."\*

But what is this "power of the Holy Ghost coming upon men?" It is the whole treasure of truth and grace, which dwelt first in the natural body of Christ, which He came to bestow on men, which He withdrew not when He ascended, but of which He promised the continuance in the Person of the Holy Ghost, and fulfils by that Person indwelling in the Church. It was the imparting the whole treasure of truth and grace by such an indwelling which made it expedient for Him to go, which made His bodily departure not a loss, but a gain, which was "the promise" of which He spoke on that last night, and which was expressly declared to be a perpetual presence leading, as it were, by the hand † into all

---

\* S. Aug. serm. 267, tom. 5, 1090, E.

† Luke xxiv. 49, and John xvi. 13—*ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, and 14, 15, *ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον*

truth—an all-powerful, all-completing, all-compensating presence, such as that alone is or can be which maintains the intellect of man in truth, because it maintains his will in grace: and, instead of the two wild horses of which the great heathen \* spoke guides the soul in her course as borne aloft on those twin divine yoke-fellows,† faith and charity.

Correlative, therefore, to the Person of Him who is at once King and God, and Head, and Bridegroom, and Father, is that singular creation of His Spirit, by which, in the Kingdom, Temple, Body, Spouse, and Mother, He deposited the treasure of the truth and grace which He became man to communicate. It was not as individual men, living a life apart, but as common children of one race, joint members of one body, that the guilt of the first father fell upon them; it is only on them as children of a higher race, and members of a far greater body, that the grace of the Deliverer is bestowed. The distinctions of race and the divisions of condition drop away as they are baptized into one body, and made to drink of one spirit. The new and supernatural life cannot be communicated save by this act of engrafting into a new body. As Eve from the side of Adam sleeping, so the Church from the side of Christ suffering; as Eve bears still to Adam the children of men, so the Church to Christ the children of Christ. These are not two mysteries, but one, unfathomable in both its parts, of justice and of mercy; but the whole history of the human race bears witness to the first, and the whole history of the Christian people to the second. It would be amply sufficient to prove what we have been saying that the first communication of the supernatural life is conferred by being baptized into one body, and made to drink into one spirit. But this is not all. There is a yet dearer and more precious gift, which maintains and increases the life so given. Our Lord stands in the midst of His Church visibly forming from day to day and from age to age that Body of His which reaches through the ages; He takes from Himself and gives to us. He incorporates Himself in His children. He grows up in us, and by visible streams from His heart maintains the life first given. Here, above all, is the one Christ, the Head and the Body. This is but an elemental truth of Christian faith, though it is the highest joy of the Christian heart. It was in an instruction to

---

παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα μένη μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. \* Plato.

† πανταχοῦ συνάπτει καὶ συγκολλᾷ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην, θαυμαστήν τινα ξυνωρίδα. S. Chrys. 3rd Hom. on Ephes., tom. xi, p. 16.

catechumens that S. Augustine said, "Would you understand the Body of Christ? Hear the Apostle saying to the faithful, 'But you are the Body and the members of Christ.' If, then, you are Christ's Body and His members, it is your own mystery which is placed in the Lord's table; it is your own mystery which you receive. It is to what you are that you reply amen, and by replying subscribe. For you are told, 'the Body of Christ,' and you reply, amen. Be a member of the Body of Christ, and let your amen be true. Why then in bread? Let us bring here nothing of our own, but listen to the Apostle himself again and again, for in speaking of that sacrament he says, 'We that are many are one bread, one body.' Understand and rejoice. Here is unity, verity, piety, charity. One bread. Who is that one bread? We being many are one bread. Remember that the bread is not made of one but of many grains. When you were exorcised, it was as if you were ground; when baptized, as if you were kneaded together with water; when you received the fire of the Holy Ghost, it was your baking. Be what you see, and receive what you are. This the Apostle said of the bread. Of the chalice what we should understand is clear enough even unsaid. For as to make the visible species of bread many grains are kneaded with water into one, as if that were taking place which Holy Scripture records of the faithful, 'They had one mind and one heart in God,' so also in the case of the wine. Many grapes hang on the bunch, but their juice is poured together into one. So, too, Christ the Lord signified us: willed us to belong to Himself; consecrated on His own table the mystery of our peace and unity. He who receives the mystery of unity and holds not the bond of peace, receives not a mystery for himself, but a witness against himself." \*

Thus the coherence of the natural and mystical Body of Christ was at once exhibited and effected in the great central act of Christian worship, and the whole fruit of the Incarnation was seen springing from the Person of Christ, and bestowed on men as His members in the unity of one Body. Thus were they taken out of the isolation, distraction, and enmity—that state of mutual strife and disorder which heathendom expresses—and made into the one divine commonwealth; and thus the Body of Christ grows to its full stature and perfect form through all the ages of Christendom.

And if there be one conviction which, together with the belief in the Incarnation itself of the Word, is common to all the

---

\* S. Aug. Serm. 272, tom. 5, 1104, c.

Fathers, Doctors, Saints, and Martyrs of the Church—which together with that belief and as part of it is the ground of their confidence in trouble, of their perseverance in enduring, of their undoubting faith in times of persecution, of their assurance of final victory, it is the sense which encompassed their whole life, that they were members of one Body, which, in virtue of an organic unity in itself and with its Head, was to last for ever. The notion that this Body, as such, could fail, that it could cease to be the treasure-house of the Divine truth and grace, would have struck them with as much horror as the notion that Christ had not become incarnate, and was not their Redeemer. The Body which the Holy Ghost animated on the day of Pentecost never ceased to be conscious of its existence—conscious that the power of its Head, the Eternal Truth, was in it, and would be in it for ever. Confidence in himself as an individual member of the Body, the Christian had not, for he knew that through his personal sinfulness grace might be withdrawn from him, and that he might fall away; confidence he did not place either in his own learning, knowledge, and sanctity, or in these gifts as belonging to any individual christian; his confidence lay in the King who reigned in an everlasting Kingdom, in the Head who animated an incorruptible Body. To sever these two would have been to decapitate Christ.\* The thought that the Bride of Christ could herself become an adulteress, and teach her children the very falsehoods of that idol-worship which she was created to overthrow, would have appeared to him the denial of all Christian belief. And such a denial indeed it is to any mind which, receiving the Christian truth as a divine gift, looks for it also to have a logical cohesion with itself, to be consistent and complete, to be a body of truth, not a bundle of opinions. Let us take once more S. Augustine as expressing, not a private feeling, but the universal Christian sense, when he thus reprehended the Donatist pretension, that truth had deserted the Body of the Church to dwell in the province of Africa. “But, they say, that Church which was the Church of all nations exists no longer. She has perished. This they say who are not in her. O shameless word! The Church is not because thou art not in her. See, lest therefore thou be not, for though thou be not, she will be. This word, abominable, detestable, full

---

\* *Quid tibi fecit Ecclesia ut eam velis quodammodo decollare? Tollere vis Ecclesiæ caput et capiti credere, corpus relinquere, quasi exanime corpus, Sine caussa capiti quasi famulus devotus blandiris. Qui decollare vult, et caput et corpus conatur occidere.*—S. Aug. tom. 5, p. 636.



of presumption and falsehood, supported by no truth, illuminated by no wisdom, seasoned with no sense, vain, rash, precipitate, and pernicious—this it was which the Spirit of God foresaw, and as against these very men, when He foretold unity in that saying, ‘To announce the name of the Lord in Zion, and His worship in Jerusalem, when the peoples and kingdoms join together in one that they may serve the Lord.’ ” \*

Now, to suppose that anything which is false has been, or is, or can be taught by the Church of God is to overthrow the one idea which runs through the titles of the Kingdom, Temple, Body, and Spouse of Christ, it is to make the Mother of His children an adulteress, to deny that power of the Holy Ghost coming down on the day of Pentecost, and abiding for ever, with his special function of leading into all truth, that presence of the Comforter in virtue of which the Apostles said for themselves and for the Church through all time, “It has seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.” With all men who reason, such a supposition is equivalent to the statement that Christ has failed in what He came on earth to do, for “the Word was made flesh that He might become the Head of the Church.” † Next, therefore, in atrocity to that blasphemy which assaults the blessed Trinity in Unity upon His throne is the miserable and heartless blasphemy which, by imputing corruption of the truth to the very Kingdom and Temple, the very Body and Spouse of the Truth Himself, the Incarnate God, would declare the frustration of that purpose which He became man to execute, the falsifying of that witness of which He spoke in the hall of Pilate, and would so annihilate that glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good-will, which was the angelic song on the morning of His birth, and is daily ‡ in the mouth of His Bride. The truth can as little cease out of the House and Temple of God as the Father and Son can cease sending the Spirit to dwell in it: the truth can as little cease to be proclaimed and taught in its own kingdom as the King can cease to reign in it. The conjugal faith of the Bride of Christ cannot fail, because He remains her Bridegroom. The power of the Head, the double power of truth and grace, cannot cease to rule and vivify His Body, because He is its Head for ever. The Mother cannot deceive her children, because she is of

---

\* S. Aug. in Ps. 101, tom. iv., 1105, d.

† S. Augustine, tom. iv., 1677—*Elegit hic sibi thalamum castum ubi conjungeretur Sponsus Sponsæ. Verbum caro factum est ut fieret caput Ecclesiæ.*

‡ By the “Gloria in excelsis,” &c. in the Mass.

one flesh with the Son of Man, in the union of an unbroken wedlock.

It has been said above that the power of that bond which from the origin of man united the race to its head was shown not only in the guilt which the act of that head was able to inflict on the body, not only in the exact transmission of the same nature, thus stained, from age to age, but likewise in that social character of the race in virtue of which such a thing as a man entirely independent of his fellow men, neither acting upon them, nor acted upon by them, never has existed nor can exist. It was in that connected mass which this social nature creates, that corporate unity of human society, that heathenism appeared most terrible, because corruption seemed to propagate itself, and evil by this force of cohesion to become almost impregnable. But it was especially in creating a corporate unity which should shew the force of our social nature for good, as the corruption had shown it for evil, that the power of the Restorer shines forth. The true Head of our race came to redeem and sanctify not so many individuals but His Body. Surely there is no distinction more important to bear in mind.\* “No single member by itself can make a body; each of them fails in this; co-operation is required, for when many become one, there is one body. The being or not being a body depends on being united or not united into one.” And, again, beautiful as the individual member, the hand or the eye, may be in itself, far higher is the beauty which belongs to the body as the whole in which these members coalesce and are one. Each member too has a double energy, its own proper work, and that which it contributes to the body’s unity, for this is a higher work which the co-operation of all produces; each a double beauty, its beauty as a part, and that which it adds to the whole: and these two, which seem to be separate, have the closest connection, for a maimed limb impairs the whole body’s force, and as to its beauty, as it is incomparably finer than the beauty of any part, so is it marred by a slight defect in one part, as the fairest face would be spoilt by the absence of eyebrows, the fairest eyes lose their lustre, and the countenance its light, by the want

---

\* οὐδέν γὰρ αὐτῶν καθ’ αὐτὸ ἐσῶμα δύναται ποιεῖν, ἀλλ’ ὁμοίως ἕκαστον λείπεται εἰς τὸ ποιεῖν σῶμα, καὶ δεῖ τῆς συνόδου· ὅταν γὰρ τὰ πολλὰ ἐν γίνηται, τότε ἐστὶν ἐν σῶμα . . . τὸ γὰρ εἶναι ἢ μὴ εἶναι σῶμα ἐκ τοῦ ἡνῶσθαι ἢ μὴ ἡνῶσθαι γίνεται. . . τῶν γὰρ μελῶν ἡμῶν ἕκαστον καὶ ἴδιαν ἐνέργειαν ἔχει καὶ κοινήν· καὶ κάλλος ὁμοίως καὶ ἴδιον καὶ κοινόν ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ δοκεῖ μὲν διηρησθαι ταῦτα, συμπλέκεται δὲ ἀκριβῶς, καὶ θατέρου διαφθαρέντος καὶ τὸ ἕτερον συναπόλλυται.—S. Chrys. on 1 Cor. 12, tom. x. pp. 269, 271, 273.

of eyelashes. It is then in the beauty of the Body of Christ that the Christian mind would exult, not merely in the several graces of those who are its members, but in that corporate unity which they present. We see in the course of the world that great image of the prophet, lofty in stature, and terrible to behold, whose head is of gold, whose breast and arms of silver, the thighs of brass, the legs of iron, the toes mixed of iron and clay. This is the form of the first Adam, seen in his race; and over against it likewise is the one man Christ, forming through the ages, gathering His members in a mightier unity. This is the Word made flesh, the Second Adam, "so that the whole human race is, as it were, two men, the First and the Second."\*

So much then is the creation of the Church superior to the creation of a single Christian as the creation of a body is superior to that of a single bone or muscle. This superiority belongs to the nature of a body as such. It is another thought, which we only suggest here, *whose* body it is. And here it appears in two very different conditions, the one as it is seen by us now, the other as it will be seen hereafter. There is, as we think, no subject in all human history comparable in interest to that which the divine commonwealth as such, when traced through the eighteen centuries which it has hitherto run, presents. What nation can be compared to this nation? what people to this people? what labours to its labours? what sufferings to its sufferings? what conflicts to those which it has endured? what triumphs to those which it has gained? what duration to that portion only of its years which is as yet run out? what promise to its future? what performance to its past? What is the courage and self-denial, what is the patience and generosity, what the genius, the learning, the sustained devotion to any work, shown by any human race, compared to those which are to be found in this race of the Divine Mother? How do those who are enamoured of nationalities fail to see the glories of this nation, before which all others pale their ineffectual fires? How do those with whom industry is a chief virtue, and stubborn perseverance the crowning praise, not acknowledge her whose work is undying and whose endurance never fails? These men admire greatness and worship success. Let them look back fourteen hundred years, when that great world-statue seemed to be breaking up into the iron and clay which ran through its feet. Then this kingdom was already great and glorious, and crowned with victory, and filled the earth. The toes of that

---

\* S. Aug. Op. imp. contr. Julian, l. 2, tom. 10, 1018, d.

statue have meanwhile run out into ten kingdoms, and the islands which were forest and swamp when this kingdom commenced have become the head of a dominion which can be mentioned beside that of old Rome, but still in undiminished grandeur the great divine republic stands over against all these kingdoms, penetrates through them, stretches beyond them, and while they grow, mature, and decay, and power passes from one to the other, her power ceases not, declines not, changes not, but shows the beauty of youth upon the brow of age, and amid the confusion of Babel her pentecostal unity. If success be worshipful, worship it here; if power be venerable, bow before its holiest shrine.

But if this be the Body of Christ here in its state of humiliation, during which it repeats the passion of its Head, if these be the grains of wheat now scattered among the chaff,\* what is that one mass to be which these shall make when the threshing-floor is winnowed out? We see the Body in its preliminary state of suffering, where it has a grandeur, a duration, and a beauty like nothing else on earth. What it shall be in its future state S. John saw when he called it the great City invested with the glory of God, the Bride adorned for her husband; and S. Paul hints, when he speaks of the perfect man compacted and fitly framed together by what every joint supplies, and grown up to full stature in the Head. There is in the redeemed, not only the exceeding greatness of the quality of their salvation, that is, the gift of divine sonship; nor, again, that this gift is heightened by its being the purchase of the Son of God, so that He is not ashamed to call those brethren whom He has first washed in His own blood: but over and above all this, one thing more, that the whole mass of the redeemed and adopted are not so many souls, but the Body of Christ. Faint shadows, indeed, to our earthly senses are House and Temple, Kingdom and City paved with precious stones of that mighty unity of all rational natures, powers, and virtues, each with the perfection of his individual being, each with the superadded lustre of membership in a marvellous whole, under the Headship of Christ. The exceeding glory of this creation, which will be the wonder of all creation through eternity, is that God the Word made flesh, the Head and His Body, make one thing, not an inorganic, but an organized unity, the glorified Body of a glorified Head.

Once more let us note the consistency and unbroken evolution of the divine plan.

---

\* *Grana illa quæ modo gemunt inter paleas, quæ massam unam factura sunt quando area in fine fuerit ventilata.*—S. Aug. in Ps. 126, tom. 4, 1429.

In the first creation of the human race the Body of Christ is not only foretold but prefigured, not only prefigured but expressed in the very words uttered by Adam in his ecstasy, the words of God delineating that act of God, the greatest of all His acts of power, wisdom, and goodness, whereby becoming man, and leaving his father and his mother,\* He would cleave to the wife He so took, the human nature which in redeeming He espoused. This, and no other, was the reason why Eve was formed out of Adam. It is the beginning of the divine plan, which is coherent throughout, which was formed in the state of innocency, which remains intended through the state of guilt, which is unfolded in the state of grace, which is completed in the state of glory, when what that forming of Eve from the side of Adam, and of the Church from the side of her Lord, what that growth through thousands of years, through multitudinous conflicts, through unspeakable sorrows, through immeasurable triumphs, shall finally issue in, shall be seen by those whom the Second Adam has made worthy of that vision, and by whom it is seen enjoyed.

---

#### ART. VII.—THE CENTENARY OF 1867.†

ON the 29th of June, 1867, Rome celebrated the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul ; and on that same day the Holy Father pronounced the decree of the canonization of twenty-five Saints. He had sent forth his invitations to all the bishops in communion with the Holy

---

\* See Origen on Matt. xiv. 17—καὶ ὁ κτίσας γε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸν κατ' εἰκόνα θεὸς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων ἄρρεν αὐτὸν ἐποίησε, καὶ θῆλυ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἐν τῷ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀμφοτέροις χαρισάμενος· καὶ καταλέλοιπέ γε διὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κύριος ὁ ἀνὴρ πατέρα ὃν ἰώρα, ὅτε ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπῆρχε, καταλέλοιπε δὲ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς ὢν τῆς ἁνῶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ ἐκολλήθη τῇ ἐνταῦθα καταπεσούσῃ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ γεγόνασιν ἐνθάδε οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. διὰ γὰρ αὐτὴν γέγονε καὶ αὐτὸς σὰρξ, ὅτε ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ οὐκ εἰσι δύο, ἀλλὰ νῦν μία γέ ἐστι σὰρξ, ἔπει τῇ γυναικὶ λέγεται τὸ, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους, οὐ γὰρ ἔστι τι ἰδίᾳ Χριστοῦ σῶμα ἕτερον παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν οὔσαν σῶμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους. καὶ ὁ Θεός γε τούτους τοὺς μὴ δύο ἀλλὰ γεγομένους σάρκα μίαν συνῆζευξεν, ἐντελλόμενος ἵνα ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωρίζῃ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου.

† In the first of our "Notices," we have a few remarks on the theological bearing of this truly unparalleled celebration. But our readers will perhaps not be unwilling to receive from an eye-witness some particulars on the external features of the magnificent event.

See, and from every quarter of the world they responded to his invitation. The official list before us gives the names and sees of four hundred and ninety-four bishops ; but this list was printed two days before the canonization, and does not, therefore, contain the names of those who arrived even on the vigil of the festival ; so that we may put them down in round numbers as five hundred. Of this number forty-six were cardinals, five being cardinal-bishops, thirty-two cardinal-priests, and nine cardinal-deacons ; there were six patriarchs—Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch (Maronite), Antioch (Greek), Jerusalem, and the East Indies,—ninety-five archbishops, and three hundred and forty-seven bishops. Amongst the cardinals, Ireland was represented by Cardinal Cullen, and by Dr. Leahy, of Cashel amongst the archbishops. England sent its one archbishop, and the bishops of Birmingham, Southwark, Plymouth, Clifton, Nottingham, Beverley, and Hexham ; and Ireland sent the bishops of Clogher, Galway, Dromore, Ross, Down and Connor, Kilmore, Limerick, Meath, and Cork. The English dependencies and colonies contributed one archbishop (Trinidad) and eight bishops ; Scotland three bishops—the Right Reverend Doctors Gray, Sterrain, and Lynch ; and America sent three archbishops—St. Louis, Cincinnati, and Baltimore, and fourteen bishops. From these statistics we see that the English-speaking Catholics in the world had forty-nine representatives at Rome—no less than one-tenth of the bishops who gathered around the successor of S. Peter on this great occasion.

But these five hundred bishops were followed by nearly forty thousand priests, who, animated by the same spirit of love and devotedness, had left their homes and journeyed to Rome to give proof of their attachment to the Holy See, and to take back to their flocks the blessing of the Father of the Faithful. French priests predominated ; they were here, there, and everywhere, and their enthusiasm knew no bounds. No one could see them gathered round S. Peter in such numbers, and witness their enthusiasm, without feeling that the reign of Gallicanism in France is past and gone. It may linger here and there, and may, perhaps, be occasionally found in an episcopal palace, but the great body of the French clergy is devoted, heart and soul, to the Holy See.

Most memorable was the scene that took place when the Holy Father delivered his Allocution to the secular clergy. The reception was to have taken place in the Sistine Chapel, but it was found that the numbers were too great, so at the last moment they were turned off to the *Loggia* above the piazza of S. Peter's. Every sentence of the Allocution



teemed with meaning, and the words that he spoke can never be forgotten by those who heard them. Powerful as is the voice of the Holy Father, much that he said was lost through the noise and confusion engendered by the anxious desire of some to approach nearer to his throne, and by the misplaced applause of others. But all had an opportunity of reading his words in print, and felt that they contained the very essence and epitome of an ecclesiastical retreat.

At Pentecost the series of festivals and celebrations commenced. Even then, large numbers of bishops and priests had arrived, and by the festival of Corpus Christi the great majority of the visitors were there. But up to the very day itself there were numerous arrivals, the last to come being, as a rule, those who lived nearest, and whose pilgrimage, in many cases, was confined to the day itself. Thousands slept in the streets that night—on the steps of churches, under the trees at the Piazza Barberini, or beside the fountains; and they were up and thronging S. Peter's before daybreak. Although the ceremony did not begin till eight, those who were wise arrived as early as six o'clock. So great was the press of carriages that the drive from the Piazza d'Espagna to S. Peter's occupied fully an hour. Some of the lamps of the previous evening's illumination were still burning by the road-side, and on the piazza of the building; from every quarter thousands were flocking to the one point of attraction, and already the square in front of the Basilica contained a great mass of human beings. Everything had been admirably arranged; and without the slightest confusion, though with some delay, owing to their numbers, the ticket-holders passed through the crowd and each one found his place, provided he arrived in time. Of course the tickets issued were more numerous than the sitting accommodation justified, but those who came too late for a seat found standing room; and the sight which they witnessed was cheaply purchased by a few hours' fatigue. It was a wonderful sight to look upon—that church, the largest in the world, filled with men and women from almost every nation under the sun. We could well understand why so great a crowd was collected outside, for there was no more room within. From midnight had pilgrims patiently awaited there, and those who had been sluggard were obliged to content themselves with seeing the procession as it came round the Piazza from the Vatican.

Having yet nearly two hours to wait we employed the time in examining in its more minute detail the elaborate decorations of the Basilica. This work had been entrusted to the architect Fontana, and though one would have wished the thing

undone, we could not but acknowledge that what he had to do he had done well. S. Peter's is truly most adorned when unadorned. But it is the rule to decorate it for a canonisation. The beautiful columns were hidden by crimson cloth, the fluting being marked out by stripes of gold braiding which, it is said, was over forty miles in length. To understand this, one must take into consideration the stupendous size of the building, where everything is so gigantic and yet so well proportioned that nothing looks extravagantly large. The arches too were draped with crimson silk curtains bordered with gold lace, and from the centre of each arch hung suspended a magnificent crystal chandelier.

Around the tomb of the Apostles, over which the High Altar is raised, were thirty silver candlesticks, in which burnt wax candles, both of unusual size, but neither looking out of proportion in S. Peter's. The Altar, at which only the Pope says Mass, was prepared for the Holy Sacrifice. Every one had prepared for another hour of prayer or listlessness or sleepiness when the lighting of the chandeliers commenced. For the wakeful in the transepts this was interesting; for the sleepy it was not so: for they were soon awakened by the crash of an enormous chandelier that fell from an arch just about the spot where an hour later on, its fall would have created a vacancy in the Episcopate. But this excitement was very mild in comparison with that which was raised a short time after. A cry of fire was heard, and on looking round we saw that the red curtains of one of the three windows of the right hand transept had really taken fire. In a minute the window was broken in and the curtain dragged out; but some of it had fallen on to the candles below and the wood-work that supported them. In a few minutes the next window was on fire; the ornamental wood beneath was again attacked, and some began to fear that the whole building would soon be a prey to the flames. It was wonderful to behold the quiet that pervaded during those moments of excitement. A few English speaking ladies—we know not whether they were English, Irish, or American—insisted on going out; but with almost this single exception the great mass of people remained quiet and confident. And their confidence was well rewarded. In a very few minutes the firemen were at work; and in one quarter of an hour no trace of this accident was left. Another rumour speedily circulated through the reserved seats far more startling than even that of fire: "A man has been killed; the building is desecrated, and the celebration cannot proceed. The revolutionists have done it to mar the ceremony." The fact was that some maniac had really committed suicide within

the sacred edifice ; but whether his madness was the result of extra devotion, as some said, or whether it was the effect of possession by the devil, no one can say. The infidel papers of Italy first of all said that he was mad, and then gave an account of his actions as though every one of them had been the result of a chain of logical reasoning. Whatever may have been the cause of this unfortunate *contretemps* it did not stay the ceremony for one moment. The Cardinal-Vicar was called out from the procession ; and after administering what sacraments he could *sub conditione* to the dying man, he at once reconciled the Church.

Soon after this incident, the voices of the Processionalists were heard intoning the *Ave Maris Stella*. We had indeed waited for the Holy Father, but He had not been idle during the time of our waiting. Before we had arrived at S. Peter's he was in the Sistine Chapel, and after having prayed a while he had intoned the first verse of that beautiful hymn that had been caught up, and continued, and repeated by the many choirs, and by the bishops and clergy of the procession. That procession had already been formed, and when the Holy Father was raised upon his *sedia gestatoria* it moved onwards through the two Piazzas to the Basilica. It was a scene well worth the journey to Rome. This was the secret of the multitudes we had seen in the Square and around the Piazzas. They knew that they had no chance of getting a place in the Church, so they contented themselves with a sight of the procession. When we heard the *Ave Maris* we knew that the beginning of the end had come ; and as the Processionalists approached the tomb of the Apostles we perceived that it was the *Corpus Christi* procession reiterated, with but very few alterations. The orphans supported and educated by the Holy Father led the van ; then came the religious of every order. The secular clergy of Rome followed, accompanied by their parochial choirs ; and these choirs had agreed, it seems, to sing in unison, and to amalgamate their forces. The real procession of the beatification began with the banners of the Saints, borne beside the members of the Congregation of Rites. The special banners borne in the procession were carried by members of the order to which the canonized belonged. As they advance we note them one by one, and we wait patiently the arrival of the Holy Father. Monks, priests, bishops, archbishops, patriarchs, and cardinals have passed before us, and still they are singing the *Ave Maris Stella*. Suddenly they cease their chant—the sound of trumpets is heard—and the choirs burst forth “*Tu es Petrus.*” The Holy Father has entered the Church. But why does he not come straight

on to the High Altar? The Procession turns aside for a while that he may kneel before the Altar of the Blessed Sacrament in prayer. At length he comes before us borne on his throne, surrounded by his Ecclesiastical Court. At the portico he was met by the Chapter of the Basilica, and now they follow him, to take their place with the other dignitaries who are to have part in the solemn function.

Seated on his throne he is addressed by the Cardinal commissioned to forward the process of canonization:—

BEATISSIME PATER.

*Reverendiss: D. Card. hic præsens instanter petit per Sanctitatem Vestram Catalogo Sanctorum D. N. J. Christi ascribi et tanquam Sanctos ab omnibus Christi fidelibus pronunciari venerandos Beatos.*

And here follow the names of the Saints.

An answer is given to this demand; and on the part of His Holiness, the Secretary of Briefs replied that, although the virtues of these holy persons already beatified were manifest, he must have recourse to prayer before proceeding further.

The Cardinal returned to his place, and the Pope, descending from his throne, knelt at the *faldistorium* whilst the litany of the Saints was chaunted—chaunted, not by a choir, but by some forty thousand voices. How they caught up that grand old Roman chaunt, and how they sent it forth from their hearts, filling the great S. Peter's with their earnest intercession! But the prayer must be again repeated: and so once more was the Holy Father requested to pronounce the decree—this time *instanter et instantius*. Again recourse was had to prayer, and the Cardinal-Deacon sang forth *Orate*. Pope, Cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and priests knelt in prayer—in quiet solemn prayer until the Subdeacon chaunted forth the *Levate*. Then the Holy Father intoned the *Veni Creator Spiritus*. There was no need of a Papal choir on that occasion. The Catholic Church had sent its choir, and priests from every nation manifested to the world their union with the centre of unity by uniting in the one invocation, sung in the one same tone. Then came silence again; and the Cardinal for a third time begged for the canonisation; and this time it was *instanter, instantius et instantissimus*; and the reply is that the Holy Father grants the petition.

And then he proceeded to pronounce the decree of Canonization—a decree that reads uncommonly like a definition of faith:—

*Ad honorem Sanctæ, et Individuæ Trinitatis; ad exaltationem Fidei catholicæ, et Christianæ Religionis augmentum, auctoritate Domini Nostri*

*Jesu Christi, B.B. Apostolorum Petri, et Pauli, ac nostra : matura deliberatione præhabita, et divina ope sæpius implorata, ac de Venerabilium Fratrum nostrorum S. R. E. Cardinalium, Patriarcharum, Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum in Vrbe existentium consilio, Beatos N. N. Sanctos esse decernimus et definimus ac Sanctorum catalogo adscribimus ; statuentes ab Ecclesia universali illorum memoriam quolibet anno die eorum natali, nempe N. N. etc. N. N. pia devotione recoli debere in nomine Pa~~tr~~is, et Fi~~li~~i, et Spiri~~tu~~s Sancti. Amen.*

After this the Cardinal and the College of Prothonotaries and Notaries Apostolic petitioned for the publication of the decree and Apostolic letters. The permission is granted, and then the process of canonization is completed.

Thus it was in July last when we had the happiness to witness this most Catholic and most ultramontane ceremony,—for the whole Catholic world acknowledged the infallibility of the Holy Father in this matter. When the decree of canonization was pronounced, there came a pause—a long pause ;—perhaps the Holy Father himself was overcome by the grand solemnity of the festival. Only sixteen of his predecessors had celebrated that centenary, and few of them had canonized so many Saints. But the work had been done, and we must give glory to God. *Te Deum Laudamus* resounded through the vast edifice, and yet it was but one man—Pio Nono, who had intoned that versicle of praise. For a moment we were hushed in surprise and wonder. Could one man fill with the sound of his own single voice that mighty building? Yes. It was so—and after the suspense choirs and clergy and the people joined in the loud “*Te Deum.*” We all took up the Roman tune, and somehow there seemed to be a marvellous unity even in voice on that day when all were united around the Pope.

When the ceremonies of the canonization were completed, then began the High Mass, celebrated by the Holy Father Himself. Impossible to describe the emotion of one who goes to Rome for the first time, and takes with him to Rome a love of the Holy Father, which is intensified a thousandfold when he sees and looks upon his God’s Vicar, and who then beholds him offering up the Holy Sacrifice, over the tomb of the Apostles! It is something indescribable—something worth living for, and something worth dying for. At that Mass the Gospels were sung, as usual in Pontifical Mass in Latin, and in Greek—and then the Holy Father preached a sermon to us and to the world.

A deathlike silence pervaded the church while he spoke, and his words must have been heard throughout the whole of the basilica. We do not say this at hazard, for at the end of

the Mass we went down to the portico, and there we distinctly heard every word of the Apostolic Benediction.

His sermon we have translated from the printed copy sent to the bishops present, and, imperfect as our version may be, it will at least give some idea of the sentiments of the Pope on this great day of his Pontificate.

VENERABLE BRETHREN AND DEARLY BELOVED SONS IN CHRIST :

At length the day, so long desired, has arrived whereon it is our happiness and high privilege to celebrate the Centenary of the Holy Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul, and at the same time to decree the veneration and honour due to saints, to many heroes of our Holy Faith. Let us then exult in the Lord, let us rejoice with spiritual joy on this great day—a day to be held in veneration by all Christendom, but a day of special and peculiar veneration and joy to this our city. For on this solemn day SS. Peter and Paul, lights of the Church, greatest of martyrs, doctors of the law, friends of the spouse and of the beloved of the spouse, shepherds of Christ's fold and guardians of the world's faith, passed together through the portals of martyrdom into the possession of their heavenly inheritance. These are the men, O Rome! through whom the light of Christ's Gospel first shone upon thee; and who changed thee from a teacher of falsehood into a docile disciple of truth. These are they who have built up for thee a kingdom in heaven, far greater than that temporal kingdom which thy heathen masters had founded. These are they who have made thee glorious as now thou art, who have made thee a holy nation and a chosen people, thy city a priestly city, and who have spread thy religious kingdom and thy spiritual rule, through the primacy of S. Peter, far more widely and extensively over the universe than ever was thy temporal sovereignty in the day of its greatest glory. And these two men clothed in garments of splendour and glory (yet clothed, too, with mercy and kindness) are our true pastors, and the veritable fathers who have begotten us through the Gospel of Christ. For where can we find greater glory than that of the blessed S. Peter? Illumined by a light from Heaven, he, before all others, recognised and realised, and proclaimed to all the world, the deep mystery of Christ's eternal majesty; and by confessing him the Lord to be the Son of the living God, laid deep and immovable the foundations of our faith in his divinity and humanity. He is that rock, most firm and most secure, on which the Son of the Eternal Father so strongly built his Church that the gates of hell could never send forth an army strong enough to prevail against it. To him did Christ entrust the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and to him did our Lord give supreme spiritual power on earth. Christ charged him with the care of feeding His sheep and His lambs, with the duty of strengthening his brethren, and with the power of governing the whole Church; promising that his faith should never fail either in himself or in those successors who have to this day filled his sacred chair.

And what greater blessedness than that of S. Paul? Elected by God to carry His name to all nations and kings, and even to the sons of Israel, he



was, in reward of his virtues, rapt even unto the third heaven to learn celestial mysteries, in order that he, the future teacher of the Church, might learn amongst the angels the doctrine he was to preach unto men. Together did they preach unto the world the mysteries of the new law, in one and the same spirit, through labours and through difficulties, in dangers, in imprisonment, and suffering, ever lovingly endured for God. Together they made known unto the Gentiles the name and the religion of Christ, overcame the philosophy of Paganism, and overthrew its idolatry. By their deeds and by their writings they shed far abroad the light of the Gospel, as the sound of their voices reverberated throughout the whole earth, and their words went forth to every quarter of the world ; and, on one and the same day, they gave together their last testimony on earth to the doctrines they had preached, confirming and consecrating them by their martyr deaths. And, therefore, Venerable Brethren and beloved Sons, standing near unto their sacred ashes, celebrating with solemn rites and with joy untold their holy festival, must we, in the first place, preach unto you their glorious deeds, and strive, one and all, to imitate their lives and actions.

But another great joy is given unto us ; for God has granted to us, on this most joyful day, to decree the honour and veneration due to the Saints, to Christ's holy martyrs, Josephat Runcvicio, and his twenty associates in martyrdom ; to the holy confessors, Paul of the Cross and Leonard of Port Maurice, and to the two illustrious virgins, Mary Frances of the Five Wounds, and Germana Cousin. Surrounded, as we are, by human infirmities,—wayfarers on this earthly road, as we are ; subject, like unto us, to many tribulations and great dangers, they — animated by unshaken faith, strong hope, and perfect love in God—and by love, too, of their neighbour ; bearing ever in themselves the image of Christ crucified, and being likened unto the likeness of the Son of God—suffered for the love of that same Christ the most cruel torments that the world, the flesh, and the devil could inflict. Through these sufferings they triumphed most gloriously ; and by their sufferings, by the splendid light of their sanctity, and by the wonderful miracles wrought through their intercession, they have shown forth the beauty and power of Christ's Church, and have left us a bright and glorious example for our imitation.

And now they are the dear and intimate friends of God. Dwelling in the heavenly Jerusalem, and clothed in the habit of glory, they are filled with excellent joy, and the happiness and bliss of God's own house overflows them with its abundant tide. For God hath filled them with the vision of Himself ; from the overflowing torrent of His happiness hath He given them to drink ; like unto the brightness of the sun is the glory that illumines them ; their heads are crowned, and in their hands they hold the victor's palm ; and thus they reign with Christ for all eternity, secure of their own eternal happiness, yet solicitous for us, and praying for our salvation.

Therefore, Venerable Brethren and beloved sons, do we give unto the God of all consolation our most humble thanks, for that, in the midst of so many calamities and dangers that now threaten the Church and Christendom, He has given unto His holy Church, in these illustrious martyrs, confessors, and virgins, an increase of protectors of this holy Church, and to the children

of that Church more models and guides in the way of perfection. Let us earnestly strive to follow in their footsteps. Animated by the same faith in God, the same hope in God, the same love of God, may we despise all earthly things, fix our constant gaze upon the things of heaven, and thus walk onwards in the way to God ; “ denying all worldly desires, and living soberly, justly, and piously,” to the end that, being thus bound together in suffering, in brotherly love, in charity, modesty, and humility, we may strive to secure our heavenly vocation.

And now do we lift up our eyes unto Thee, O Lord our God, who in the richness of Thy mercy dost manifest Thine omnipotence by sparing and pardoning the guilty. Look down, O Lord, in Thy loving mercy, upon Thy holy Church bestormed on every side. Look down upon Thy Christendom—that civil society founded by Thee on earth, which is now in such grave peril ; and by the intercession of Thy holy apostles, Peter and Paul, by the intercession of these holy martyrs, confessors, and virgins, turn away Thy wrath from us, multiply Thy mercies towards us, and, by Thine almighty power, grant that Thy holy Church, victorious over its enemies throughout the whole world, may be spread over the whole universe. Grant, O God, that error and vice may disappear before it, and that all tongues and nations may be united in oneness of faith, and in the confession of Jesus Christ, Thine only Son, our Lord.

And vouchsafe, O God, in the might of Thy right hand, to protect and defend this Holy City from the snares and designs of its enemies and Thine.

After the Homily the indulgences were published, and then the offertories were made to the Holy Father by the representatives—that is to say, members of the same religious order—of the Saints. These oblations consisted of two enormous wax candles (for each Saint), weighing sixty pounds, profusely decorated in gold and silver, and embellished with portraits of the Saint. The second offering is of bread, the third of wine, and fourth of birds ; but as the fourth is divided into three, it makes in all six distinct offerings, each of which is presented by a Cardinal. The third offering is of three cages : the first contains a pair of turtle-doves, the second two ring-doves, and the third is filled with all sorts of singing birds. And when this last cage was presented to the Pope on this occasion, every bird piped forth a song of joy, and their melody was heard by all who were near the throne. This is no fiction—it is *fact*.

After this offertory, the Holy Father returned to the altar, and continued the Mass. Those who know Rome, know that at the elevation he gives benediction with the Consecrated Host, and that instead of communicating himself, he receives the consecrated species from the Cardinal-assistant. After the canonization, it was only Pontifical Mass. But there was

one part of that Mass which we cannot pass over without mention—and that is the music.

Around the galleries of the dome there was a chorus of boys. Beneath them another of tenors; lower down, at the four domal pillars, four mingled choirs; far away at the end of the church, other choirs; and when these choirs took up one after the other, then one with the other, then one portion with the other, and then all combined, the effect of solo, duet, chorus, and combination of choirs, was marvellous. “*Tu es Petrus*,” we hear from above. Surely it is the voice of angels in heaven—so soft is it, and so melodious. And as these voices descend, others join them, and alto and tenor and bass join, not in word, but in sound. From around the dome and through the building come the mystical words “*Tu es Petrus*”; and the accompaniment that floats from mid-air, and which sounds like the tones of many organs, is that of many choirs chaunting in harmony, and imitating in their tones the sounds of an orchestra. Faintly and solemnly their chaunt seems to be dying away, when from the choir at the entrance of the basilica it is caught up and thrown back by a hundred voices; and from portico to altar the words resound like peals of thunder, *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam*. And when they return to the other choirs they are received with harmony. They are met in the dome by angelic voices, and on every side there is a choir ready to take up the theme, and to give with it due honour of accompaniment. Bewildering at first, astounding and electrifying was this composition of Mustafa. Critics may have found fault with it; but we may defy them to point out any modern composition, without any orchestral accompaniment, that has produced so wonderful a success. Throughout the whole of the basilica there was not a sound to be heard save those that came from the choirs. “*C’est le ciel*,” said an old Dutch priest—and really if we could all and one of us have distilled harmony as the singers did, we should have possessed one at least of the gifts that Lessius attributes to the blessed in heaven.

---

## ART. VIII.—F. RYDER'S THEOLOGICAL CITATIONS.

*Idealism in Theology.* By Rev. F. RYDER. Notes A and C. London: Longman.

*Triomphe du Saint Siège et de l'Eglise.* Par MAUR CAPPELLARI, actuellement Grégoire XVI. Traduit de l'Italien, par M. l'Abbé JAMMES. Louvain: Vanlinthout.

WHOEVER reads F. Ryder's pamphlet with a view to the infallibility question, will at once pronounce, that by far its strongest point consists in its theological citations. The author's personal criticisms of Dr. Ward *are* merely personal criticisms, whatever their merit in that capacity. Again, his strictures on our treatment of the Galileo question have hardly more than a personal bearing. Coming to the question itself of infallibility, we do not think any great impression will generally be made, by the difficulties which he raises concerning "ecclesiastical faith." Then, as to the argument which we had derived for our doctrine from the express declarations of Popes and bishops, F. Ryder may almost be said to ignore it altogether. But his theological testimonies, as they stand in his pamphlet, look somewhat formidable. Some of the greatest names in theology figure in his list. We steadfastly maintain indeed that it is from the *Ecclesia Docens*, and not from theologians, that a Catholic is to learn his Rule of Faith. Still we frankly admit, that if these great writers really supported F. Ryder—if the Church, while herself teaching one doctrine, really permitted approved theologians to advocate its contradictory—the whole theology of the matter would be involved in inextricable confusion. Our readers however are well aware, that we strenuously deny every allegation of the kind.

Let us begin with stating most briefly the point at issue. In an earlier article of this number (p. 348) we divide the Church's doctrinal judgments into two classes: (1) definitions of faith, which condemn the contradictory tenet as *heretical*; and (2) *minor* doctrinal judgments, which brand the contradictory tenet with some milder censure. F. Ryder indeed considers the censure "erroneous" equivalent to that of "heretical"; and considers definitions of faith, therefore, somewhat more numerous than we do. But this being understood, the difference between him and ourselves is most easily stated. He

confines the Church's infallibility to what he accounts definitions of faith, while we extend it to all her doctrinal judgments without exception. And coming to the particular issue now before us—he alleges that his view is supported by those theologians whom he adduces; while we maintain, not only that the case is otherwise, but that they would have been shocked at the very thought of such a doctrine as he ascribes to them.

Now we say with perfect sincerity, that we regard F. Ryder as having conferred a most important service, by examining theological works with reference to this question. It would be an endless task—and at last an entirely unsatisfactory one—if some advocate of our own doctrine were laboriously to look through the folios of a theological library, with the view of extracting every apparently adverse testimony. How could he satisfy others—how could he satisfy himself—that he had adequately accomplished his task? F. Ryder, on the contrary, has had every possible motive for diligent exploration. He feels very earnestly on his own side, and has displayed considerable theological reading: so that we have every reason for confidence, that the citations which he has brought together are, at all events, a fully sufficient sample, of the testimonies adducible against us. This is an advantage in the controversy which has not hitherto existed; and which must tend powerfully (we cannot but think) to its satisfactory termination. We much regret indeed, that in this particular article we are compelled to be more frequent than we could wish, in our direct references to F. Ryder; for we desire most strongly that the whole discussion should be as impersonal as possible. But as at this particular point of the combat our position is purely defensive, we must refer throughout to the details of that assault, which we are engaged in repelling.

The controversy stands thus. That the Church herself emphatically teaches our thesis, we have argued in our present number from p. 339 to p. 344. Our present question concerns merely the testimony of theologians. Every theologian who regards the Church as infallible in her various minor censures—who regards her, e. g., as infallible in her condemnation of Baius and Quesnel—gives the weight of his authority in our favour, and against F. Ryder; for nothing can be more certain, than that those condemnations contain no definitions of faith. See p. 369 of our present number. If some theologian can be found on the other hand, who *denies* that the Church is infallible in these minor censures—who thinks, e. g., that there can be any censured proposition of Baius or Quesnel which does not *deserve* its censure—that theologian gives

the weight of his authority in F. Ryder's favour, and against ourselves.

It is F. Ryder's distinct proposition, then,\* that the Church's fallibility in most of her minor censures is a recognized opinion in the schools; an opinion avowedly held by certain approved theologians: nay, he alleges as most explicitly in its favour, no less names than those of Ballerini, and of Cappellari, afterwards Gregory XVI. Now in the first place consider this. S. Alphonsus, Viva, and many other theologians ("plurimi theologi," see p. 365 of our present number) denounce this opinion as actually *heretical*. Take the testimony of S. Alphonsus alone. If he has one distinctive peculiarity, it is his constant reference to the dicta of theologians on every different side. Then again, he was (so to speak) behind the scenes: he did not derive his knowledge merely from books, but was in contact with living theological tradition. Is it credible that he can have spoken as he has, if the opinion which he so vehemently denounces is one freely permitted in the Catholic schools? Or had he so spoken, is it credible that the authorities, who examined his works with a view to his process of canonization, should have reported there was nothing in them deserving of censure?

Then it is to be observed, as Dr. Ward points out (p. 25), that F. Ryder has not adduced one single theologian, great or small, approved or otherwise, who has said in so many words that the Church is fallible in any of her minor censures. Lugo declares it to be the common doctrine of theologians that she is infallible in all of them. F. Ryder himself (p. 52) says "the schola seems agreed in condemning, as at least proximate to error, the denial that any of the condemned propositions merit the censure which the Church attaches to them." Only he further considers, that various members of that schola did not "demand an absolute *interior assent* to the thesis, that the censured proposition deserves its censure." The following then, according to him, was their view: "It is close upon error to *deny* the justice of a censure; but you are not at all required *interiorly to believe* its justice." If a whole class of theologians *held* this very subtle and singular view, is it credible that not one of them should have *expressed* it? that they should all of them have stated the *unlawfulness* of *denial*, and not one of them have stated the *lawfulness* of *interior dissent*? Nay, they all used the word "error"; which

---

\* Great part of the two succeeding paragraphs appeared in our July number.



surely, in its natural sense, refers rather to *thought* than to the *expression* of thought.

Here then are two antecedent improbabilities, the force of which it is difficult to exaggerate. It is difficult to exaggerate the improbability of the supposition, that a number of theologians have *implied* what confessedly no one of them ever *expressed*; and it is difficult to exaggerate the improbability of the supposition, that a number of approved theologians have held as *true*, what another number of approved theologians have been permitted to denounce as *heretical*.

We will now proceed to F. Ryder's individual citations; and we will assume that those of our readers who are interested in the matter, have his pamphlet at hand for reference. The great majority of his testimonies, it seems to us, may be dispatched very briefly; but there are two which demand more careful attention, viz., those from Ballerini and Cappellari. We will begin then with the former class; and it will be our simplest plan, to take them as they stand in F. Ryder's notes. We should add that in cases where F. Ryder's citations are obviously inadequate to his conclusion, and where the works of such theologian are not readily accessible to us, we shall not feel under the obligation of taking pains to look up passages from him of an opposite character. We first take up Note C on "The Sphere of Ecclesiastical Infallibility," p. 69.

(1.) Suarez says (de Fide, d. 5, s. 8, n. 4):—"It is a Catholic truth that the Pontiff, defining *ex cathedrâ*, cannot err . . . when he authentically proposes something to the Universal Church as to be believed *de fide*." Well, Suarez does not say here that Papal infallibility is *confined* to this; and he does say immediately afterwards that it is *not* so confined. His question, as stated by himself, is "whether the Supreme Pontiff, even without a General Council, be an infallible Rule of Faith." In answer to this question, he first lays down (in the words quoted by F. Ryder) that infallibility appertains to him in its most obvious and palpable object-matter; viz., definitions of faith. Having given reasons for this opinion (nn. 4-6), he proceeds (nn. 7-9) to deduce therefrom three inferences. Since the Pope, argues Suarez, is infallible (without waiting for Episcopal assent) in definitions of faith;—he is also infallible (without waiting for such assent), (1) in matters of universal discipline; (2) in canonizing Saints; and (3) in approving religious orders. For a fuller explanation of Pontifical infallibility under this last head, Suarez refers to an earlier work of his; and we will therefore follow him in that reference: de Religione, vol. iii. l. 2, c. 17, nn. 19-22. The Pope, he considers, is most certainly infallible in pronouncing, that a certain

proposed rule of life is in no respect contrary to good morals ; also (n. 20) that it contains all the requisites for a genuine religious order ; and inclusively (n. 21) that it is really conducive to the acquirement of perfection. There is a further question, however : viz., whether the establishment of this particular order, at this particular time, is necessary or useful to the Church (n. 22). As to this, he considers it "perhaps the more pious opinion" that on this question also the Pope is infallible.\* Observe, he is inclined to think it more probable than not, that the Pope is actually infallible on this detail of mere expediency. Certainly then, Suarez is not one of those who would have doubted (see p. 293 of our present number) that it falls fully within the Pope's province, to decide infallibly on the necessity of his civil principedom. Nor should it be forgotten that this chapter from the "de Religione" is that to which Suarez himself refers in his "de Fide," for a fuller explanation of his doctrine on Papal infallibility.

But we are not left to inference for Suarez's opinion on the point now at issue. He lived after Baius's condemnation by S. Pius V., and has written on that very subject : see Prologomenon 6 ad opus de Gratiâ, c. 2. We are quite confident our opponent will at once admit, when his attention is turned to the chapter, that Suarez throughout takes absolutely for granted the simple infallibility of the Pontifical Act ; that the idea never even occurs to him, of any Catholic doubting such infallibility. If F. Ryder dissents from this opinion, and will signify as much to us publicly or privately, we pledge ourselves to argue for it in our next number. Otherwise we will gladly spare both space and our readers' patience.

But if you would know how very far beyond definitions of faith Suarez extends infallibility, look at his reply to a well-known difficulty. F. Ryder is of course well aware, how greatly theologians have been tormented by an answer which Nicholas I. gave to some recently converted Bulgarians. They asked him what should be done about several of their countrymen, who had been baptized by a Jew ; and he replied (Denz. n. 264) that these persons ought not to be baptized again, if they had been baptized even by a Jew in the Name of the Blessed Trinity, *or even in the Name of Christ Alone*. This last part of the answer is confessedly a doctrinal mistake. F. Ryder however will at once say, that the case presents no difficulty whatever ; because it is so very evident that

---

\* Nam esto non habeat Pontifex specialem Spiritûs Sancti assistentiam ut in hoc etiam non erret—quod non solum incertum est, sed etiam contrarium est fortè magis pium—nihilominus, &c."

here was no definition of faith. Far different is Suarez's language: see *De Sacramentis*, d. 21, s. 3. He finds the question very perplexing: "it is difficult to know how to answer." He suggests one interpretation of the Pope's words, which would harmonize them with true doctrine; but which he admits to be "somewhat forced," though "pious and probable." On the whole, however, he inclines to a different solution; viz., that, while the substance of Nicholas's reply is *ex cathedrâ* and infallible, the doctrinal mistake occurs in a mere *obiter dictum*. This is quite intelligible: because the Pope's answer to that particular question which he was asked, was indubitably sound; and the doctrinal mistake concerned a particular, which he went out of his way in touching at all. Suarez, at all events, never dreamed of doubting, that the answer, given to a private doctrinal inquiry of certain Bulgarians, was in substance infallible.\*

It may be asked, in passing, how we ourselves explain Pope Nicholas's mistake. We reply that Suarez goes greater lengths on the extent of infallibility, than we are prepared to follow; and that we cannot regard this answer to the Bulgarians as *ex cathedrâ*. It possesses none of the marks which we have mentioned in an earlier article (p. 288-290) as characteristic of such utterances. On the contrary it was evidently intended, we should say, for the instruction of certain Bulgarians in a doctrine *already* determined, and not for inculcating on the whole Church some *new* doctrinal determination. It was one of those instructions to which we refer in p. 295; one of those instructions which are officially put forth by the Pope *as* Pope, and yet not precisely in his capacity of Universal Teacher. As to these doctrinal instructions, we hold it as a piously probable opinion, that God will never permit a Pope to err in the doctrinal instruction therein conveyed. And this opinion is plainly not refuted by the fact before us; because the doctrinal guidance, which the Bulgarians sought by their question, was imparted to them with perfect accuracy and truth. Their question did not refer to the form, but to the minister, of Baptism.

(2) F. Ryder next quotes (p. 70) the Salmanticenses. These great writers lay down that the Pope is infallible "on things of faith; on [things which relate to] the Church's good

---

\* It may be worth while to quote what F. Coninck, S.J. (a considerable authority) remarks in reference to a pronouncement of Pope Pelagius on this very question. "Theologians," he says, *commonly consider* that Pontiffs speak definitively," i.e. *ex cathedrâ*, "when *answering directly a question proposed to them.*" *De Sacramentis*, q. 66, n. 53.

morals; and on other things of the same kind which appertain to the common spiritual welfare (*salutem*) of the flock." They add, however, that he can err on matters which are "PURELY philosophical and natural;" and those "which relate to [mere] facts;" and those which, although in some sense they concern the things of faith, yet do not appertain to the consistent maintenance (*consistentiam*) of the Faith, or the spiritual welfare of the faithful."\* Presently the Salmanticenses speak of this latter class as "*res quæ non sunt de substantiâ fidei.*" This phrase "*de substantiâ fidei*," which F. Ryder italicizes, is declared by the Salmanticenses themselves to be synonymous with the phrase "*quæ pertinent ad fidei consistentiam.*" And they declare the Church infallible in all things which either thus "pertain to the consistent maintenance of the Faith," or conduce "to the health of souls," to the spiritual welfare of the people. No words could more clearly express our own doctrine. See p. 353 of our present number. We should also draw attention to the word "purely" which we have printed in capitals. The Church then is infallible on things "philosophical and natural," if they are not *purely* such; i.e. if they have some real relation to things theological and supernatural.

(3) With the three quotations from Tanner which follow, we are in such simple agreement, that we cannot even conjecture on which expression our opponent intends to lay stress. By the term "erroneous in faith" is meant "unsound in any way under the head of faith." See p. 338 n. of our present number. Tanner declares that the Pope speaks infallibly, not only when "he openly says" that some tenet is thus unsound, but even "otherwise, if he uses preceptive words" commanding the interior assent of all Catholics. Those Pontifical utterances alone are fallible, according to Tanner, in which the Pope merely "expresses his own private opinion, or proposes something only as the more probable doctrine." We are to infer from the Pope's words, and from the circumstances of the case, whether such is his intention in any particular instance; and we are to be guided in this inquiry by the judgment of wise men and the sense of the faithful. So says Tanner, and precisely so say we. We may add that Tanner agrees in every respect with Suarez on Nicholas's answer to the Bulgarians. And we may also add, that in his treatise on Grace he refers to S. Pius V.'s condemnation of Baius (q. 3, nn. 71-77). We are quite sure F. Ryder will admit, if he looks at Tanner's

---

\* If "*salutem*" in these two sentences means "salvation," and not "spiritual health," our argument remains precisely the same.

argument, that that theologian never dreamed of any Catholic *doubting* the infallibility of S. Pius's Act.

(4) In p. 34 there is an extract from the "*Acta Colloquii Ratisbonnensis*." The Jesuits are asked for some sign of the Pope speaking *ex cathedrâ*. In their reply there is no appearance whatever of their *limiting* infallibility to the particular cases they mention; on the contrary, their language taken naturally implies the reverse. They do not even include the case in which an anathema is implied but not actually expressed. Moreover, if their second answer had been intended to *limit* infallibility, it would have been directly contradictory to their first; for their first answer *includes*, while their second *excludes*, those very minor judgments—such as the censure of Baius and of Quesnel—on which our whole argument turns. In the Bull "*Unigenitus*," e. g., the Pope on the one hand neither pronounces nor implies an anathema; while yet on the other hand he most distinctly expresses an intention of "*obliging the whole Church*." According to F. Ryder's interpretation, F. Gretser would decide in his first answer that Clement XI. issued that Bull *ex cathedrâ*; but would at once contradict himself in his second, and declare that Clement XI. merely issued it "*as a private man*" ("*ut privatus*.")\* It may be added that one of the two Jesuits was Tanner, whose doctrine on the extent of infallibility has been placed before our readers. The second answer evidently means this: "*Well at all events, wherever the Pope expressly pronounces an anathema, he speaks ex cathedrâ; and we are prepared to defend against you every dogma which he has so sanctioned.*"

(5) Next we come (p. 71) to Bolgeni. Our opponent infers from this writer's language, that he would deny the Church's infallibility in her condemnation of Baius and of Quesnel. But in the very same work—nay, in the very same chapter—Bolgeni says expressly the direct reverse. Here is some of his language:—

I must premise that *under the name of Jansenist* I intend to include all those who . . . *impugn the Bulls* . . . against the doctrines and books of *Baius*, *Jansenius*, and *Quesnel*. . . .

I say in the first place that [these men] *have not the Catholic Faith*.† I speak of those points which are in controversy between them and us, and on which *the Church has spoken* in the Bulls against Baius, Jansenius, and

\* Gretser indeed lived before the days of the "*Unigenitus*." But will F. Ryder himself allege that he considered S. Pius V. to have condemned Baianism merely as a private individual?

† Bolgeni then is one of those theologians who account it actually *heretical* to deny the Church's infallibility in minor censures.

Quesnel. . . . Let us take as our example the Dogmatic Bull "Unigenitus" against the doctrines of Quesnel. It is a fact of *the highest certainty* that this Bull is a *dogmatical judgment of the Church* \* confirmed by the actual assent, teaching, and preaching, of (morally speaking) the whole body of pastors. . . . I place then this Bull in the hands of a Jansenist, and I ask [him, "Do you believe that the doctrine of Quesnel, comprised in the hundred and one condemned propositions, is false (*cattiva*) and contrary to the doctrine of Jesus Christ?" &c. &c. &c.

The most insidious method pursued by the Jansenists [would] lead me to found myself in things of faith on my private spirit and judgment, at the very time when I hear *the voice of the Church* speaking to me in her dogmatical Bulls. . . . When the Church presents to me *her proximate rule to form my faith*, the Jansenist would have me abandon this, and have recourse to the remote rule (art. 8).

According to Bolgeni then, the Bull "Unigenitus" is part of a Catholic's proximate Rule of Faith; and those who will not yield it their interior assent, "have not the Catholic Faith."

6. Now as to the passage cited by F. Ryder from Stapleton. The Church may err, says that theologian, when "she is consulted † or *incidentally* (*obiter*) disputes" on those questions "which may be called appendices of faith." But she is infallible in her conclusions and her assertions (though not in her arguments) concerning all questions which are *openly called into controversy*, even though they may not necessarily appertain to the public dogma of faith.‡ Is this F. Ryder's doctrine? or is it not rather our own?

(7) As to the quotation from Driedo, if our opponent will explain what are the particular sentences which he considers to his purpose, we will pledge ourselves to meet him in our next number. We are honestly unable to understand his drift in adducing them. The question at issue is this. The Church, avowedly in performance of her duty as guardian of the Deposit, solemnly pronounces certain minor doctrinal judgments. Is she, or is she not, infallible in such pronouncement? We cannot see that Driedo is touching this question

\* Not a "definition of faith," you see, but a "dogmatical judgment." See p. 348 of our present number.

† "Consulted" by private individuals for their own private satisfaction. Stapleton says immediately afterwards that she does *not* err when "consulted" on matters "publicly called into controversy."

‡ "In disputationibus autem quæ circa quæstiones ad dogma fidei publicum necessario pertinentes versantur, vel ALIOQUI in controversiam aperte vocantur, *consulta* Ecclesia *concludendo* quidem et *asserendo* nunquam errat. In mediis autem et *argumentis* hallucinari et aberrare poterit."



ever so distantly. Those matters in which he accounts the Church fallible, are those which she only "proposes as probable, likely." "Of this kind are the lives, miracles, &c., of holy martyrs."

To sum up. In not one of F. Ryder's theological citations is to be found the slightest trace of F. Ryder's own doctrine; viz., that the Church's infallibility is confined within the limits of the Deposit. The Jansenists indeed (see *postea*) held that her infallibility was restricted to her testification of revealed truths; but F. Ryder has been unable to find one Catholic theologian who uses language at all similar.

In note A., F. Ryder puts together various citations, for the purpose of showing (p. 30) that "the Word of God, or Revelation," on one hand, and "Divine faith" on the other hand, "are strictly and exclusively correlatives." But we hold this proposition more strictly than he does; for he maintains, while we deny, that an act of Divine faith can be directed to some *deduction* from what God has revealed. He further holds indeed (*ib.*) that the sphere of *infallibility* does not extend beyond the sphere of *acts of faith*; but we cannot see that any of his quotations give him the least support in this. All Catholics are agreed in repudiating the Protestant calumny, that the Church professes to receive new revelations, and to coin new articles of faith. All Catholics are agreed, that the Deposit was delivered once for all by the Apostles; and that the Church of subsequent ages has no infallibility, except in guarding that Deposit from danger direct or indirect. More than this not one of the writers adduced even seems to say. Viva indeed, who heads the list, is one of those who account it actually *heretical* to deny the Church's infallibility in her minor censures. However here as before, if F. Ryder will mention clearly the sentences on which he lays stress, and their bearing on his argument, we pledge ourselves fairly to encounter them.

Note B contains a catena of theologians who teach that a *censured* proposition, though infallibly *deserving* its censure, may nevertheless be *true*. But we have never doubted that several approved theologians teach this; and that the question is perfectly open. See p. 346 of our present number.

It remains then to consider Ballerini and Cappellari. We will begin with some general remarks on a whole class of theologians, to which these two may be referred; and we will afterwards consider the particular passages now adduced.

The school of Bossuet, as every one knows, rested its chief stress on history; and ever since his time there has

been a considerable body of Ultramontane writers, who make it their special business so to guard the Ultramontane doctrine, as to render it safe (in their eyes) from historical attack. There is not one of them, e. g., we suppose, who would not at once throw overboard Nicholas's response to the Bulgarians, as being manifestly external to the sphere of infallibility. The theologians of whom we speak agree profoundly, in their general doctrine, both with each other and with themselves; while at the same time they differ indefinitely, quite as much from themselves as from each other, when they proceed to draw out their general doctrine into particulars. The obvious dictate then of common sense is, that we shall attach the greatest weight to that general doctrine on which they are in harmony, and no weight at all to those particular applications on which there is such wide divergence. This simple consideration will carry you through the whole difficulty. Or rather there is no difficulty at all: unless F. Ryder ascribe to these theologians a larger infallibility, than *we* claim even for the Pope speaking *ex cathedrâ*; unless he invest their very obiter dicta with sacro-sanct authority.

Their general doctrine is this. They claim infallibility for the Pope, only when he delivers doctrinal judgments; when he teaches the Universal Church; when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*. These three qualifications are identical with each other, and are so considered by this whole school. They *contrast* doctrinal judgments with two different classes of dicta, which Gallicans were constantly confounding therewith. On the one hand, a Pope's *expressions of opinion* on a doctrinal subject, however strong, are not doctrinal judgments; still less can his mere *refusal to pronounce* be accounted a judgment. Never does he pronounce a judgment, unless when he indicates his intention of binding the interior assent of all Catholics. On the other hand, even those utterances which *contain* a doctrinal judgment, do not always *exclusively* consist of doctrinal instruction: they may contain also preambles, arguments, and obiter dicta, which make no pretence to infallibility.

Now in the cases most hotly contested between Gallicans and Ultramontanes, no *doctrinal judgments* were even alleged which were not *definitions of faith*. If S. Liberius—if Honorius—pronounced a false doctrinal judgment at all, he pronounced a false definition of faith. It happened therefore often enough, and not at all unnaturally, that in the heat of argument Ultramontane champions forgot the existence of *minor* doctrinal judgments. Their one immediate end was to show that Honorius, e. g., never pronounced a doctrinal *judgment* in favour of the Monothelites; and they inferred this fact most

justly from the circumstance, that he never expressly or equivalently *anathematized* the contradictory doctrine. The notion never crossed their mind, of Honorius or any other Pope being fallible in a *minor* doctrinal judgment; but there was nothing in the particular controversy to remind them of this question. "Never," they said, "does the Pope speak *ex cathedrâ*, unless expressly or virtually he pronounces an anathema." Or "in no statements is he infallible except in definitions of faith." Both propositions were perfectly true, on such particular questions as formed the matter of discussion; nor could anything be more natural than that for the moment they did not pause to consider, of how extreme a misinterpretation their words were susceptible.

Dr. Ward, in the Preface to his work on "doctrinal decisions," gave an instance of this from the Würzburg theologians. In that part of their work which leads them across the Gallican controversy, these very able writers say in effect that the Pope never speaks as *Universal Teacher*, unless he implies an *anathema* on dissentients. Yet in another treatise, when Quesnel and the Bull "Unigenitus" are before them, they treat it as among the most elementary of Catholic truths, that that Bull is infallible. And there is one particular especially to be observed. The very principle which they had themselves laid down in their earlier treatise,—viz., that the Pope only speaks *ex cathedrâ* when he implies an anathema,—is merely contemplated in their later argument, as an *objection* which the Catholic controversialist is required to answer (pp. xx-xxiii).\*

Moreover, the confusion was increased by the ambiguity of such terms as "definition of faith;" "contrary to the Faith;" and the like. Thus the verb "define" is by no means confined to those judgments which condemn a tenet as *heretical*. In the Encyclical "Singulari nos," e. g., Gregory XVI. refers to the "Mirari vos" as having "*defined* Catholic doctrine." And again, "contrary to the Faith" need mean no more than "contrary *in tendency* thereto;" for Martin V. (see p. 340 of our present number) declared that those tenets are "contrary to the Faith," which he condemns respectively as temerarious, seditious, and offensive to pious ears. Similarly speaks Pius IX. in that sentence of the "Quanta curâ" which we treat in the appendix to our article on "Minor Doctrinal

---

\* The Preface to Dr. Ward's volume is prefixed to our issue for April 1866. As it there stands, the above reference should be pp. x.-xii.

Judgments." He censures a certain error as "*opposed*" (*adversetur*) to *Catholic dogma*. Yet he is assuredly not condemning it as actually *heretical*. An Ultramontane then very naturally started with one meaning to his terms; and in the course of his argument unconsciously changed it for another narrower and more stringent.

Nor was there anything in the Gallican controversy to remind him of this confusion. His Gallican opponents went quite as far as he did, on the object-matter of Infallibility. In January, 1866 (p. 261, note) we quoted language from the Cardinal de Noailles, which conclusively shows that the whole French clergy held undoubtingly the Church's infallibility in her minor doctrinal censures. In the "*Pastoralis officii*," Clement XI. declares that he adopted the plan of censuring Quesnel's propositions in *globo*, because Louis XIV. and the majority of French bishops repeatedly declared that in no other way could the existing tumults be appeased. And to a similar effect indeed, the French bishops in a body wrote to the king on a later occasion. "You need only read," say the bishops, "the professions [of belief] which Martin V. drew up at the end of the Council of Constance, to see that the Pope regarded" such "censures . . . as *appertaining to dogma* and as intended for *directing believers in the order of faith*." \* There was no possibility therefore of the Ultramontane being misunderstood on this head by his Gallican opponents; and he was naturally, therefore, the less cautious in weighing his words.

Here then are the two theories, between which a decision has to be made. According to F. Ryder, Ultramontanes restricted the object-matter of infallibility to definitions of faith; and they were fully prepared to concede—nay, laid especial stress on their readiness to concede—that the Pope never speaks *ex cathedrâ* in his minor doctrinal judgments. According to our own theory on the contrary, an Ultramontane was in no respect behind his Gallican opponents, in the extent which he ascribed to the Church's infallibility: the very notion never crossed his mind, of drawing any contrast between definitions of faith and minor doctrinal judgments. His whole argument consisted, in contrasting doctrinal *judgments* on the one hand, with mere expressions of a Pope's private *opinion* on the other hand. Now we have already mentioned (see p. 486) two overwhelming improbabilities (as they seem to us) which militate against

---

\* Quoted by Montagne. "*Cursus*," vol. i., p. 1117.

F. Ryder's view. We will next mention three or four other antecedent arguments on our own side, which apply to that special class of theologians whom we are just now considering. And we will, lastly, consider Ballerini and Cappellari in particular, whom F. Ryder has chosen as his favourite *representatives* of that class.

(1) If Ultramontanes limited the Church's infallibility to her expressed or implied anathemas, this is saying in other words that they limited it to the declaration of things revealed. And so F. Ryder understands them: he confines infallibility within the sphere of *acts of faith*. Now F. Knox draws attention to Fénelon's statement, that this is the fundamental principle of the Jansenists.\* It is most incredible that Fénelon could thus have spoken, had his own Ultramontane friends maintained this very principle.

(2) F. Ryder expresses most justly (p. 31) the true animus of these theologians. "They had to meet numberless objections, plausible at least, grounded upon the apparent mispronouncements of Popes 'in materiâ fidei;' and they dared not undertake the defence of more than it was necessary to their position to defend, or than they could defend satisfactorily." We ask him, then, this question: Do these writers ever by any accident admit, that some Pope has made a mistake in a public and authoritative condemnation, published by him, of some tenet? And do they add that such admission is consistent with Ultramontane doctrine, because the mistake occurs, not in condemning a tenet as *heretical*, but as branding it with some *lower* censure? We are confident he can allege no one such case. Now he has pointed out with the greatest truth, that they adjust the thesis with which they start, to their power of historically defending that thesis. The one legitimate exposition, therefore, of the thesis which they *intend to lay down*, is the thesis which throughout their argument they *in fact maintain*. But in no one instance do they admit, that the Pope has erred in any minor doctrinal judgment; and they cannot therefore have intended pointedly to allege, that he is *capable* of error in such judgments. They lay down no limitations to his infallibility, except those which are to serve them in their controversy; but this limitation never serves them in their controversy, and they never intended therefore to lay it down.

(3) Consider further, how widely (as we have just pointed

---

\* "The fundamental principle so much vaunted by the [*Jansenist*] party is false and unsustainable. This principle is, that the Church's infallibility *does not extend beyond things revealed*." (Œuvres, tom. xiv., p. 46.)

out) Gallicans extended the object-matter of infallibility. Surely it is more improbable than words can say, that an Ultramontane should have been the one who, in opposition to his king-ridden rivals, restricted the Church's prerogatives.

(4) Those very writers, who speak occasionally as though the *Pope's* infallibility were limited to definitions of faith, never make such a restriction when speaking on the *Church's* infallibility. This had been urged by Dr. Ward; and we understand F. Ryder (p. 31) as admitting the fact. He replies, however, by laying down some admirable doctrine on the Church's infallibility, which it gives us sincerest pleasure to quote. She "possesses an infallibility," he says, "not only when she puts on her robes of prophecy, but *inherent in her very vital action.*" "The Church dispersed is our infallible guide '*vivâ voce et praxi.*'" By "the Church dispersed" he understands, of course, the Episcopate, acting in union with the Pope, but not actually assembled in Council; and he considers his authorities to hold that she is infallible "*vivâ voce et praxi.*" But if she is infallible "*vivâ voce et praxi,*" à fortiori she is infallible, when in set words she condemns some tenet as scandalous or temerarious. If therefore you put F. Ryder's two opinions together, they come to this. He considers Ballerini, Cappellari, and the rest to hold, that the Pope *acting by himself* is infallible only in *definitions of faith*; but that, *when united with the Episcopate*, he is infallible in *all* his doctrinal judgments. He cannot surely on reflection acquiesce in this as being their view; but if he does—and if he himself accepts that view—our controversy with him is so far at an end. For as to the "*subject*" of infallibility—whether it resides in Pope alone, or in Pope and bishops,—it is absolutely external to the present issue.

We may be very certain then, à priori, that neither Ballerini, Cappellari, nor any other Ultramontane theologian ever limited the Church's infallibility to definitions of faith.\* Let us next

---

\* Muzzarelli is not one of F. Ryder's authorities; but the *Tablet* quotes very pertinently a long passage from his work "*de auctoritate Romani Pontificis.*" We can desire no better illustration of what we have been hitherto urging, than a careful examination of that passage. And it has this curious characteristic. Muzzarelli in one sentence, incidentally and without laying the slightest stress on it, requires for an *ex cathedrâ* utterance that it shall pronounce the special censure of *heresy*. But soon afterwards he quotes a passage from Maimbourg the Gallican, as expressing with singular precision the point at issue between Ultramontanes and Gallicans: and this passage does not allude ever so distantly to the *particular* censure of "heresy." And if we turn to Muzzarelli's little work on Papal infallibility, we find that he assumes as a matter of course the infallibility of the "Unigenitus"; and also of Fénélon's condemnation, which exclusively



consider their actual words. Unfortunately Cappellari in no part of his volumes happens to speak expressly of minor censures: but Ballerini does; and in close contiguity with one of the two extracts, given by F. Ryder in note C. It is perfectly certain then that, so far as Ballerini is concerned, the question can be brought to a most decisive issue. If F. Ryder's theory be the true one, Ballerini, on mentioning these minor censures, will at once say: "Here I come to the point on which I have been insisting throughout; the Pope's infallibility is confined to definitions of faith, and these minor censures therefore may be thrown overboard." On the contrary, if our own theory be correct, it will no more have occurred to Ballerini that the Pope can be mistaken in the latter class, than in the former. We will simply then translate the paragraph, that our readers may judge between F. Ryder and ourselves; putting into italics a few words here and there, to which we desire particular attention.

A few remarks must now incidentally be made, on the causes which lead some men *to accuse of error* those Pontifical decrees which brand certain propositions in globo with various censures, if some among such propositions appear to them to be true, and to have been uttered by pious and holy men. But *how idle is such an objection*, any one will readily perceive who considers the peculiar nature of such decrees. For since the censures are many, and many propositions are condemned together in globo and respectively,—in order that *the justice and truth* of the proscription be manifest, it is not necessary that every censure should apply to every proposition; but it suffices if any one censure apply to this or that proposition. . . Moreover, among the various censures, not all imply falsehood or heresy, but temerity; offence to pious ears; equivocalness; scandal; a captious sense; &c. &c.: which notes may *justly* be applied to propositions *in some sense true*; but which *are justly condemned by the Church* . . . in such a way that *the true sense* is not on that account to be understood as condemned, which they can bear by a sound interpretation, and in which they have been accepted by pious and holy men. If on this head any one wishes to see fuller remarks which *most abundantly vindicate from error* the above Pontifical decrees, let him consult

---

consisted of censures below that of heresy. (French translation, Avignon, 1826, pp. 7, 151.)

The *Tablet* in a later number refers to a well-known passage in Perrone. But we considered that passage in January, 1866; and to what we then said we may further add, that Perrone invariably speaks of Baius and Quesnel as infallibly condemned. Thus, opening his prælections almost at random, we find him saying (de Gratiâ nn. 104, 138) that the contradictory of a Baian thesis "*spectat ad Catholicam doctrinam*"; that Vasquez was indubitably mistaken on one point, because his view in effect coincides with Baius's (n. 108, note); &c., &c. But on F. Perrone's judgment see the Appendix to this article.

Melchior Canus de locis l. 12, c. 10. Compare also the second dissertation of Cardinal Noris . . . where he shows that the very same propositions and words have been in different senses at one time approved at another condemned by the Church, without any *prejudice to her infallibility* thence arising."—c. 15, n. 42.

Ballerini is apparently one of those comparatively few theologians, who hold that a censured proposition, while fully deserving its censure, may nevertheless be true in the very sense in which it is condemned. But this is a question absolutely irrelevant to our present issue. And any one who reads the above extract will see most clearly, that so far from admitting the Pope to be fallible in minor censures, Ballerini considered it an essential portion of his design peremptorily to rebut any such supposition.

What we said a few pages back will abundantly explain Ballerini's slight occasional inaccuracy of expression, if indeed any such exist, in the passages extracted by our opponent.\* The general scope of his argument is most undoubtedly in full accordance with our own doctrine. Clement XI. says expressly in the "*Pastoralis officii*" that those who will not accept the "*Unigenitus*," "do not adhere and assent to Us and the Chair of Blessed Peter," nor are "true sons of the Holy Roman Church." And yet, as we have so often pointed out, the "*Unigenitus*" contains no definition of faith whatever. And we should here therefore only further point out, as "Q" has already done in the *Westminster Gazette*, that F. Ryder has unintentionally given undue support to his own opinion, by changing Ballerini's "*dissensiones*" (p. 71) into "*heresies*" (p. 32), and "*opiniones*" (p. 71) into "*judgments*" (p. 32).

Ballerini's language then, instead of telling against us, counts with extraordinary strength in our favour. It is demonstratively certain that he does not deny, but on the contrary upholds, the infallibility of minor censures. And the more therefore you dwell on the apparent *indications* of a different opinion, presented by his occasional language,—the more you strengthen our case. It is absolutely certain that Ballerini is on our side and not on F. Ryder's; and the mere fact that Cappellari uses language strikingly *similar* to Balle-

---

\* We doubt if there is any. We know of no reason for supposing that he anywhere uses the phrases "*ex Catholicâ fide*," "*ex Catholico dogmate*," as exclusively applying to truths which cannot be denied without *heresy*. As to "*definitiones fidei*," he undoubtedly means by that term what we have called "*doctrinal judgments*." See c. 15, s. 10.

rini's, cannot be accepted as by itself sufficient proof, that he *differs* from Ballerini on the point before us.

It happens unfortunately for our purpose, that Cappellari nowhere expressly speaks of minor censures one way or the other; and that we cannot therefore obtain the absolutely demonstrative argument in his case, which we have in Ballerini's. It will be necessary in consequence to examine his argument at much greater length; though if our readers will but have the patience to follow our remarks, we are very confident they will find our demonstration no less conclusive. Cappellari indeed, we fully admit, so far as his words go, says that the Pope never speaks *ex cathedrâ* except in definitions of faith; that his judgment is not "definitive," unless "he qualifies the contrary doctrine as heretical," or "fulminates an anathema" against its upholders, or uses some "equivalent" expressions. If then Cappellari's full and deliberate meaning is to be measured by what he precisely says in one particular place, F. Ryder has full right to allege his authority. On our side however we maintain, that no supposition can be more untenable than this. And we will preface our argument by once more drawing out in contrast F. Ryder's theory and our own.

Before doing this, we must make one preliminary remark which will be found of much relevance. A definition of faith is a much more serious and solemn Act, than a minor doctrinal judgment. In a definition of faith, the Pope declares some verity as actually belonging to the Deposit. Such a verity claims to be believed by the firmest of all possible assents, an act of Divine faith. He who denies such a verity, knowing it to have been defined, is *ipso facto* external to the Visible Church; nor can he be admitted to the sacraments, however invincible may be his ignorance of the Church's authority. It is to be expected, therefore, that for a definition of faith the requisite marks of an *ex cathedrâ* pronouncement, though similar in *kind*, should be more pronounced and emphatic in *degree* than for a minor judgment. This remark is necessary, we think, for an apprehension of Cappellari's meaning.

F. Ryder holds that that theologian meant exactly what he said; that he was considering the question of minor doctrinal judgments, and deliberately expressing an opinion that they are external to the sphere of infallibility. On our side we maintain that such a supposition is simply out of the question. Cappellari's great object, we contend, was to draw a broad line between the Pope's doctrinal *judgments* on the one hand, and his doctrinal *opinions* on the other. In doctrinal judgments the Pope speaks as Pope; in doctrinal opinions he speaks as a

private doctor. His doctrinal opinions however, adds Cappellari, may be found not merely in his rescripts, private letters, and the like, but even in utterances which convey this or that doctrinal *judgment*; for the *reasons* assigned by him for some judgment proceed from him merely as from a private doctor. It became therefore very important for Cappellari's purpose, to lay down precise rules which might enable Catholics to distinguish between a Pope's private opinion and his *ex cathedrâ* judgment. Now, for reasons we have already explained, the particular *class* of doctrinal judgments which Cappellari had in his mind, were definitions of faith and no other. In laying down therefore the marks of an *ex cathedrâ* utterance, he was thinking exclusively about definitions of faith. But the marks of an *ex cathedrâ* utterance required for a minor judgment are (as we just now observed) less pronounced and emphatic in degree (though the same in kind) than those required for a definition of faith. Had his attention been called to the particular case of minor judgments, he would undoubtedly so far have modified his statement.

Here then is theory against theory. F. Ryder's is far the more simple, and on the surface far the more probable; yet we venture to predict that if you will look below the surface, you will arrive at a firm conviction that ours is the true one. Over and above the very strong general arguments which we have already drawn out, we will give here five further independent reasons applying to Cappellari in particular.

(1) Cappellari was a distinguished theologian. No one will accuse him of not knowing the fact, that S. Alphonsus and other theologians account it actual *heresy* to deny the Church's infallibility in her minor judgments. Nay, such ignorance is even less credible, because S. Alphonsus's statement occurs in his well-known dissertation against Gallicanism, which Cappellari must have specially read for the purpose of his book. He was also of course well aware, that no approved theologian in the whole Church had ever called in question this infallibility. If we were to grant (for argument's sake) that he felt himself at liberty to go against so great a mass of authority, it is at least very obvious that he would not have done so episodically and parenthetically; he would not have left his readers to *infer* so momentous an opinion; he would not have implied but *expressed* it.

(2) According to Cappellari, every single theological proposition, uttered by a Pope at all, is uttered by him either in his capacity of Universal Teacher or of private doctor. He denies throughout any intermediate case whatever. Now nothing can be more undeniable, than that the "Unigenitus" contains

no definition of faith, nor brands any particular proposition whatever with the note of heresy. On the other hand it was addressed formally by the Pope "to all Christ's faithful," and ended by strictly forbidding them to dissent interiorly from its declarations. According to F. Ryder, Cappellari considers Clement XI. to have issued this exclusively in his character of private doctor; he regards it as possessing no greater authority over the interior belief, than if it had been some short theological treatise written by Bellarmine or Suarez. Go back to Innocent X.'s condemnation of Jansenius, and F. Ryder must attribute to Cappellari a still stranger opinion. He must consider Cappellari to hold that, when that Pontiff denounced Jansenius's first proposition as *heretical*, he spoke indeed *ex cathedrâ*; but that when in the same breath he declared it temerarious, impious, and blasphemous, he only expressed his own private theological opinion. As to the last of Jansenius's propositions, Innocent X. condemned it as false, temerarious, and scandalous; adding that, if understood in one particular sense, it is also heretical, and deserving of other censures. According to F. Ryder, Cappellari would thus have analysed the Pontiff's intention: "I give my private opinion, that this proposition is false, temerarious, and scandalous; moreover, if it be understood in one particular sense, I also privately opine, that it is impious, blasphemous, contumelious, and derogatory to the Divine Piety. But my judgment as Pope is entirely limited to the assertion, that in this latter sense the proposition is heretical." F. Ryder then attributes to Cappellari a lower notion of infallibility, than that entertained by the very Jansenists; for they invariably admitted that *the five propositions themselves* had been in every respect infallibly condemned. Of course F. Ryder will not on reflection dream of accepting such a conclusion as this; but, if he do not accept it, he must become a convert to our theory, that Cappellari did not mean precisely what he said.

(3) The whole course of Cappellari's argument, throughout the chapter, consistently favours our view while directly contradicting F. Ryder's. It will occupy some considerable space to make this clear; but so mischievous a use has been made of Cappellari's authority, that we had better (now we are about it) do the thing as thoroughly as we can. We will begin then with analyzing the general argument of that truly forcible and admirable chapter on which F. Ryder relies.

Cappellari begins with observing that his opponents, contrariwise to reason and common sense, refuse to draw any distinction between the Pope speaking as Chief of the Hierarchy

and speaking as a mere private doctor (p. 217). To hear them argue, he says, you would suppose that on the Ultramontane view a Pope is infallible in all his words, and in all his practical resolutions: whether they do or do not bear on the Faith; whether they are addressed to the Church, or concern only an individual. What can be more unreasonable, he asks, than this? If the Pope's Popedom is supposed to destroy all his personal qualities, it must equally destroy his offices of Roman Bishop, Metropolitan, Patriarch (p. 218); and, whatever command may be given by his authority to the local Church of Rome, must oblige the whole Catholic world. "We draw a distinction," reply the Gallicans (p. 219). "The Pope may *command*, we admit, in a non-Papal capacity: but when *doctrine* is in question, the Pope has but one intellect; and we cannot therefore distinguish between his judgment as man and his judgment as Pope." True, replies Cappellari, he has but one intellect; but may not lights reach that intellect from more than one source? When he clothes himself with his full authority, and when accordingly he claims to oblige the consciences of the faithful, the lights which visit his intellect are supernatural. It is always free to the Pope whether he shall or shall not exercise his Primacy; but it is only when he does please to exercise it, that God has promised to guide him infallibly. You yourselves make such a distinction in the case of Bishops in Council; why may we not make the very same in the case of a Pope? (p. 220.)

So far then at least, nothing can be further from Cappellari's mind, than to draw any distinction between definitions of faith and minor judgments; or to restrict the Pope's infallibility within the actual Deposit. The question does not occur ever so distantly. The one point on which he is intent, is to distinguish between the *judgments* of a *Pope* and the *opinions* of a *private doctor*. If in the last five pages of the chapter he had really intended, as F. Ryder thinks, to dwell on the former distinction, he would have been suddenly introducing an idea totally alien from the context.

He next proceeds to express various tests, by which Catholics may certainly know whether a Pope does or does not speak *ex cathedrâ*. Within three pages he twice goes over the same ground in different language; and it will therefore be a most useful key to his meaning, if we compare in each case the two different expressions of his thought. We will denote them respectively by the letters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

First test. ( $\alpha$ ) "The point defined must appertain to the Faith" (p. 223); and ( $\beta$ ) "the decree must treat questions of faith" (p. 226). Whether this point appertains to the Faith



directly or indirectly, proximately or remotely, is a matter not here mentioned, and wholly external to the course of his ideas. At the same time, as we have so often said, we have no doubt that his thoughts were occupied with that class of questions, on which a doctrinal judgment *would* be a definition of faith.

Second test. (a) "The Pope defines a point of faith for the purpose of tracing to the faithful the infallible rule of their belief, and leave them no doubt, perplexity, or disquietude: his judgment therefore must declare, that his own thoughts are fixed and determined on the matter" (p. 224). (β) "The terms of the decree must exhibit no hesitation" (p. 226).

Third test. (a) "The Pope is prince of the Church, and the Faith is a matter of universal interest for her: when, therefore, he decides as her chief, he must make his decision known to the Church." Here, there is no corresponding β.

Fourth test. (a) "He must therefore in this decision speak to the Church, and consequently address it to the Church herself" (β). "The decree must be addressed to the whole Church." "The Church" here is self-evidently the "Ecclesia," not "Docens," but "Credens." This test, therefore, would mean in its obvious sense, that every utterance *ex cathedrâ* is addressed,—like the Bull "Unigenitus"—"universis Christi fidelibus," or in some equivalent way. But F. Ryder must hold, just as strongly as we do, that Cappellari either did not mean this, or else was altogether mistaken. We have no doubt whatever, because of a fact to be presently mentioned, that he did not mean it; but the remark cannot possibly be defended in its obvious sense. There is one instance which will at once occur to every Catholic, whenever reference is made to definitions of faith put forth outside a Council; viz., the Immaculate Conception. Well, the Bull "Ineffabilis," which contains that definition, is not headed "Universis Christi fidelibus," but "In perpetuam rei memoriam." If Cappellari literally meant what his words express, he would not have considered the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as infallibly defined by Pius IX. Indeed the heading "Universis Christi fidelibus" is quite rare and exceptional in dogmatic Bulls. In a future number we shall have to enlarge on this fact: here it will suffice if we draw attention to S. Leo's well-known dogmatic letter against the Eutychians. Muzzarelli points out (*de Infallibilitate*, vol. ii., p. 86) that the whole Episcopate accepted it as "infallible and irreformable." Yet it was addressed *in form* to one person, the Patriarch S. Flavian.

What Cappellari meant then is most obvious. In order to be accounted as speaking *ex cathedrâ* the Pope must be

understood as enjoining the circulation of his decree, in every part of Christendom where it may be needed. This is the particular characteristic of an *ex cathedrâ* utterance, on which we have ourselves more than once emphatically insisted; see e. g. p. 289 of our present number. But most certainly this characteristic applies to a large number of minor judgments, quite as prominently as to any definitions of faith.

Fifth test. (a) "The Supreme Pontiff in defining *exercises the office of judge*: it is in that quality that he determines the object of faith and commands the will to subject the intellect thereto; and not like a *simple theologian* whose office is exclusively to *convince the reason*. It is necessary, therefore, that the terms of the definition should show an intention to exist in the Pope, of commanding *absolutely* and in *virtue of his supreme authority* the act of faith on this particular article." (β) "The decree must express an express will to bind consciences." The strict wording of this test, as of others, is of course exclusively applicable to a definition of faith; but its general drift applies equally to minor judgments. The decree, says Cappellari in effect, must show plain and unmistakable marks of expressing a *judgment*, and not merely an *opinion*; of being intended to demand *interior assent*.

Sixth test. (a) "Certain formalities are established and determined by a constant use of the Church and the Popes, in order that all Christendom may know in a precise manner the Pope's supreme and definitive judgments and the punishments incurred by those who are refractory. If the Pope omits such a (*cette*) formula, without sufficiently indicating that (notwithstanding such omission) he intends to define as Sovereign Pontiff and judge of the Faith, you must thence conclude that he has *not* pronounced judgment in that capacity; because he is bound to accommodate himself to the intelligence of all (*à l'intelligence universelle*). The chief of these formalities consists in qualifying the opposite doctrine as heretical; or fulminating an anathema against those who should hereafter profess it. You ought not then (*on ne devra pas donc*) to regard as *definitive* those judgments of the Pope, in which you do not find this formula or something equivalent; nor to believe that in uttering them he understood himself or intended to exercise his primacy of authority." (β) "No decree is dogmatical which is destitute of the characteristic formalities."

This is the test on which F. Ryder would lay his principal stress. And yet, even if it stood alone, it is almost conclusive (we think) against F. Ryder's opinion, that Cappellari intended to contrast definitions of faith with minor doctrinal judgments.

The reason he gives for requiring the phrase "heretical" or the like, is not at all because Pontifical infallibility is confined to the Deposit; but exclusively in order that the Pope may be understood to speak "definitively." But who can possibly say that a Pope speaks more *definitively* in definitions of faith than in minor judgments? Take the Bull "Auctorem fidei." According to F. Ryder, Cappellari means, that Pius VI. spoke definitively indeed when he condemned the five first propositions as *heretical*; but *not* definitively, when in the very same authoritative tone he denounced others as scandalous or pernicious. But *this*, at all events, *cannot* be Cappellari's drift; and what *is* his drift, seems to us really obvious enough. It is not merely, he says, the general contents of a Pontifical Act, which determine its *ex cathedrâ* character; there must also be certain technical characteristics, to distinguish a judgment from a mere opinion. Such characteristics are the pronouncement of an anathema,—or again (by parity of reason) of some minor censure,—on the condemned theses. Such again would be the phrases "pro muneris nostri officio," "ex plenitudine potestatis," &c. &c. Such, lastly, would be the form of an Encyclical Letter addressed by the Pope to all Catholic bishops. See p. 289 of our present number. At the same time Cappellari is careful to add, that such technical characteristics are not strictly necessary; but on the contrary, that the Holy Father, even while omitting them, may "sufficiently indicate that, notwithstanding such omission, he intends to define in his quality of Sovereign Pontiff and judge of the Faith."

Sixth test. The obiter dicta, even of an *ex cathedrâ* Act, are not to be accounted part of its doctrinal instruction. On this there is no reason for quoting Cappellari's words at length. We hold, as strongly as F. Ryder, that preambles, arguments, and obiter dicta are external to infallibility.

We say then, that you directly contradict Cappellari's whole drift and context, if you try to insist with rigour on his individual phrases; if you understand him to advocate so truly extraordinary an opinion, as that the "Unigenitus" and great part of the "Auctorem fidei" are the mere unauthoritative utterances of private theological opinion.

(4) Here also, as in all F. Ryder's other authorities, there is no trace whatever of any recognition of F. Ryder's fundamental principle, that infallibility is confined within the Deposit. The idea is absolutely external to Cappellari's whole argument; nor is it to be found (so far as we can discover) even hinted in any part of his two volumes.

(5) We now proceed to a reason, which will be admitted by

every one to clench the whole. Never was there a more simply doctrinal composition, than the Bull "Unam sanctam." This will be admitted alike by Catholic, Protestant, and infidel. There is not a single disciplinary command in it from first to last: it is occupied exclusively, either with laying down a certain definite doctrine on the due relation between Church and State, or else in giving reasons for that doctrine. Now Cappellari, in the chapter which succeeds the present, speaks of that Bull as having "for four centuries served as a rule to the Catholic universe" (p. 279). He cannot therefore possibly suppose, that it is the mere expression of Boniface VIII.'s private opinion; he must hold, on the contrary, that it is an utterance *ex cathedrâ*. Yet Cappellari's own six tests are not applicable to this Bull at all, unless you soften down (as we have done) their more rigorous meaning. It is not in form addressed to the whole Church—either *Ecclesia Credens* or *Ecclesia Docens*—but is headed "In perpetuam rei memoriam." It does not in so many words "express an express will to oblige consciences;" you can only say (and that indeed with perfect truth) that its whole structure, tone, and texture imply an authoritative and *ex cathedrâ* character. Lastly, its general teaching, though infallibly true, will not (we suppose) be considered by any one as *de fide*. At all events (which alone is to the purpose) neither directly nor by implication does the Bull pronounce an anathema on those who dissent from any portion of its teaching as to the due relations between Church and State.

If our readers have had patience to follow this long train of argument, we cannot doubt they will have long since confidently arrived at our own conviction. They will be as convinced as we are, that nothing was more absolutely external to Cappellari's thoughts, than any dream of disparaging the Church's infallibility in her minor judgments.

But now, lastly, even if it could be maintained with any kind of plausibility that Cappellari the theologian denied this infallibility, no one can doubt that Gregory XVI. the Pope affirmed it; and that those "supernatural lights" of which Cappellari speaks "illumined his intellect" in that particular. His Encyclical, the "*Mirari vos*," was no definition of faith; yet see the view he takes of its authority. Without again troubling our readers by a detail with which they are now familiar, let them look to a subsequent Encyclical—the "*Singulari nos*" issued on June 23rd 1834. In this second Encyclical he speaks of that "*Catholic doctrine*" concerning obedience to kings, indifferentism, liberty of conscience, and the like, which, "*in accordance with the authority committed to us* (*pro auctori-*

tate humilitati nostræ traditâ) *we defined* " in the " *Mirari vos.*"

The argument deducible from facts for the infallibility of the " *Mirari vos* " is really weakened by its very strength. The proofs of Gregory XVI.'s intention are so multifarious, that the cogency of each one is inadequately apprehended. It is for this reason that we will here confine ourselves to this later Encyclical. If in the " *Mirari vos* " he had *not* been issuing a definition *ex cathedrâ*,—then, in the " *Singulari nos* " he solemnly declared to the whole Episcopate what he knew to be a falsehood: that falsehood being nothing less than the mendacious allegation of a pretended dogmatical fact, and the solemn promulgation of a false and spurious rule of Catholic belief.

It is not more certain then that Gregory XVI. was Pope at all, than that he issued the " *Mirari vos* " *ex cathedrâ*. And let us now, with this fact well established in our mind, look back on the treatise which he wrote before his elevation to the throne. According to our own view of that treatise, the " *Mirari vos* " possessed all the marks, internal and external, assigned therein as requisite for an utterance *ex cathedrâ*. And if\* a new edition of this work was printed at Rome under the author's supervision the very year when the " *Mirari vos* " appeared, considerable probability thence accrues, that we have rightly interpreted its tenor. But let us suppose, for argument's sake, that F. Ryder had apprehended Cappellari's treatise correctly: what would follow? It is Cappellari himself who points out how serious are the errors into which a Pope may fall, when writing as a private doctor: and if an actual Pope, how much more a merely prospective one! It is the strangest way possible of showing respect for Cappellari's work, to violate its principal maxim. We say, with Cappellari himself, that where the Pope and the theologian are at variance, it is not the Pope who may be adusted with the theologian, but the theologian who must be corrected by the Pope.

Moreover it is most certain that, in the year 1832 at all events, Cappellari the theologian was in completest harmony with Gregory XVI. the Pope. Supposing therefore he had once thought otherwise, it is absolutely certain that he had changed his opinion, at a time when his opinion, even as a private theologian, carried with it an authority indefinitely greater.

---

\* This was stated by a priest writing in the *Tablet* without any signature. We are not otherwise acquainted with the fact.

To conclude. F. Ryder may possibly say that, even if his citations do not warrant his conclusion, they have nevertheless real force against our own doctrine on the infallibility of Encyclicals. This is of course in itself quite possible; and we will not fail therefore in our next number to notice the allegation. In our present article, however, we have dealt exclusively with the inference which F. Ryder himself would draw from his authorities. And on this head we thus sum up our argument. He alleges that certain approved theologians deny the Church's infallibility in her minor censures. Against this supposition there are three tremendous *à priori* improbabilities. It is improbable, in a degree which it is difficult to exaggerate, (1) that approved theologians shall have denied what the Church so indubitably teaches; (2) that a number of theologians should have *implied*, what confessedly no one of them ever *expressed*; and (3) that a number of theologians should have been permitted to advocate as *true*, what another number have been permitted to denounce as *heretical*. These improbabilities, however, do not of course dispense us from the obligation of examining F. Ryder's citations. We have done so therefore in detail; our conclusion being, that not one of those whom he adduces really held the tenet which he ascribes to them. The primary and direct argument for the Church's infallibility in these minor judgments, must ever be, of course, her own express and emphatic teaching. Yet there is another argument also for the same doctrine—secondary indeed in kind, but equally complete and absolute in degree; viz., the unanimous testimony of approved theologians.

---

As we find that various reports have been circulated, to the effect that F. Perrone disapproves our view on the extent of infallibility, we have thought it better on reflection to enter at somewhat greater length, on the doctrine of this distinguished theologian. We are not aware that he deals expressly with the question of minor censures in any part of his works, except in his recently published treatise on the theological virtues (A.D. 1865). The passage to which we refer is in the first part of that work, and extends from n. 499 to n. 522. It thus commences:—

An opinion seems to have prevailed among some, that any doctrine or proposition, which has not been branded as *heretical*, may be thought a matter of small moment (*parvi facienda sit*); just as though a man would be *guilty of no fault* who, excluding formal heresy, should not fear to assert a con-



demnable proposition which should be akin to heresy. For the purpose of uprooting *so pernicious a persuasion* I have thought it worth while, &c. &c.

F. Perrone then divides censures into "doctrinal" and "judicial." "Doctrinal" censures are merely those ascribed to propositions by this or that theologian; but "judicial censures" are those pronounced "by legitimate authority, *especially* by the Roman Pontiff or an Ecumenical Council." Of a "judicial" censure he lays down that it

Has the power of binding in conscience: because it has efficacy in God's sight (*coram Deo valeat*), Who has appointed the Church to be *magistra* and judge in *all* those things which *in any manner* (*quoquo modo*) appertain to faith and morals.

Here observe, firstly, how distinctly F. Perrone declares, that the Church's magisterium extends to *all* things *in any manner* appertaining to faith and morals. And observe, secondly, that those judicial censures which are pronounced by the Church herself, are considered by the author as part of her magisterium. Now, that F. Perrone considers the Church *infallible* in her magisterium, is admitted even by F. Ryder (p. 31); F. Perrone therefore must regard her as inclusively infallible in that particular *part* of her magisterium, which is here under consideration.

The author belongs to that far more numerous body of theologians, who hold that every condemned proposition is quite certainly *untrue* in the sense in which it is condemned. The censured doctrine, he says, "*necessarily* not only must be false, but carries with it a certain excess over the common grade of falsehood" (n. 500). He then proceeds (nn. 501–521) to recite and explain those particular censures which the Church most frequently uses; and in this detail we need not follow him.

Finally, as to the guilt incurred by those who maintain condemnably propositions. He is speaking, be it observed, of propositions which the Church herself as yet has not actually censured.

We must add, he says, as regards the asserters or maintainers of such condemnably propositions, that they are not *free from sin, and that mortal* (*haud culpâ carere eâque gravi*), if this be done knowingly and deliberately. Because for the most part such things are blurted out (*effutiuntur*) from a certain rashness; from love of novelty: and their authors meanwhile expose themselves to a serious danger of error, from which they will afterwards hardly or not at all be able to draw back their foot; and, besides, they give others scandal.

It seems pretty clear that F. Perrone is here speaking, not of those merely who externally "assert or maintain" such propositions, but of those also who interiorly accept them as true. For he says that those whom he mentions "expose themselves to serious danger of error;" and, of course, such danger is incurred, not less by assenting to a proposition, than by externally maintaining it.

So much then on those "condemnable propositions," which the Church has as yet not censured. "Persons," he very naturally adds, "exhibit themselves *still more in fault*, if the question concerns propositions already condemned by the Church or by Roman Pontiffs."

To complete our exhibition of F. Perrone's view on the Church's minor doctrinal judgments, we will here reprint a letter recently addressed by Dr. Ward to the *Westminster Gazette* :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "WESTMINSTER GAZETTE."

SIR,—A few weeks ago the *Tablet* quoted a passage from Father Perrone's "Prælections," as being inconsistent with those views, which I for one, with many others, have been recently advocating on the extent of infallibility. Moreover, several reports have been in private circulation, that that distinguished theologian dissents from such views. For myself, I have never consciously had any wish in the whole matter, except to ascertain and follow the Church's teaching; and as I was very desirous of gaining any fresh light, I thought it the best thing to obtain, if I could, some direct information on Father Perrone's opinion.

I wrote, therefore, to a most kind friend of mine—a Jesuit Father living in Rome—and asked him if he could obtain for me some authentic reply, which I might be at liberty to publish. The controversy between Father Ryder and myself turns on two main questions: (1) The infallibility of minor doctrinal censures; and (2) the infallibility of doctrinal Encyclicals. I selected instances, therefore, of each. As to the former, I mentioned the "Unigenitus" and the "Auctorem fidei," both of which abound with these minor censures: in the one expressed "in globo;" in the other "specifically." I asked my friend to inquire of Father Perrone, whether he would say *totidem verbis* that these two Bulls "are infallible decisions of the Church." As my instance of doctrinal Encyclicals, I took the "Mirari vos." I drew attention to the subsequent Encyclical "Singulari nos," wherein Gregory XVI. declared that in the "Mirari vos" he had "defined Catholic

doctrine" on certain particulars. And I asked my friend to inquire of Father Perrone, whether he would say *totidem verbis* that "the Catholic doctrine" thus "defined" in the "*Mirari vos*" is infallibly true.

The reply which I have received is as follows:—

"I have proposed to Father Perrone your two questions; nay, I have put under his eyes your very words. (1) 'Would he not confess *totidem verbis* that the *Unigenitus*' and the '*Auctorem fidei*' are infallible decisions?' (2) 'Would he not say that this Catholic doctrine of the "*Mirari vos*" is infallibly true?' To both questions he tells me to answer *AFFIRMATIVÈ ET ULTRA*; and *he repeated it strongly twice*. He adds that *he has never had a doubt about it . . .* and he urges me to send the letter to-day by the quick post."

My friendly correspondent adds:—"You will see also how strongly Father Perrone speaks of the Encyclical and the appended Syllabus, in his article in the '*Omaggio Cattolico*,' towards the end."

I remain, sir, faithfully yours,

W. G. WARD.

## ART. IX.—AN IRISH SESSION.

*Pleas for Secularization.* By AUBREY DE VERE. London: Longmans; Dublin: Duffy.

IT is an old idea of Mr. Bright's that, if Parliament could only be induced to devote one whole session exclusively to Irish affairs, and if the leaders on either side would agree in their capacity and according to their conscience as statesmen rather than as heads of Party to the principal points of an Irish policy, that the labours of that one immortal Irish session would abundantly suffice to pacify Ireland for evermore. We are promised some such panacea at present. Apparently for want of anything else to say, many organs of opinion are pleased to anticipate that Parliament will spend the session of 1868 almost exclusively in considering the condition of Ireland; and some are even so sanguine as to expect a violent demise of the Church Establishment before the Easter holidays. If our saying that we shared this expectation could in any way promote the desired result, such words

should not be wanting as would at least indicate our hope of it; but at present the expectation only appears to us in the light of an exercise of credulity. Lord Russell, indeed, has written a letter to say that the year 1868 is destined to witness the fall of the Irish Church. It may be so; but certainly at present Lord Russell does not appear to us to exercise that control of public events and political parties which gives promise to the predictions of statesmen. It has taken seven centuries to bring the affairs of Ireland to their present pass; and the policy which may ultimately give peace to that hapless country will hardly be extemporised in a session, least of all in the session of 1868, and under the inspiration of Lord Russell. That session may indeed see certain concessions made to the Catholics of Ireland of considerable value of a character consistent with the general policy of the present Ministry. Much may especially be hoped for and attempted in regard to the question of denominational education. A charter for the Catholic University is, we may say, almost within reach. It is not impossible that the Irish Chief Secretary may propose and carry an enlarged edition of the useful, though not altogether adequate, Landlord and Tenant Bills, which he proposed last session. If Parliament should have any spare time and be in a particularly good humour, it might not be quite vain to attempt the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act. These are all practical objects, capable of being promoted without the assumption of any hostile party complexion, and which, indeed, it would be far easier for the present Ministry to concede than it would have been for their predecessors. But the question of the Irish Church comes before us at present rather as an English Party cry than as a serious object of Irish policy; and there never was a time since O'Connell's death when the Irish people could so ill afford to be carried away by an English Party cry as at present. Nor is there any Party leader in England, whom it is so demonstrably unsafe for them to trust on this question as John, Earl Russell of Ardsalla. It is now many years since he succeeded in ejecting a Tory Ministry from office on the Irish Church question; but when he succeeded to office he never attempted to carry out the policy of the Appropriation clause. On the contrary, his opinions in office underwent so complete a change that he ultimately became a stanch defender of the Irish Establishment as one of the necessary bulwarks of the Constitution against the encroachments of the Catholic Church. In the year 1853, speaking on the motion of the then hon. member for Mayo, Mr. George Moore, the noble lord said:—

I am far from denying that there are many members of this House, and many members of the Roman Catholic persuasion, both in this country and in Ireland, who are attached to the throne and to the liberties of this country; but what I am saying, and that of which I am convinced, is, that if the Roman Catholic clergy had increased power given to them, and if they, as ecclesiastics, were to exercise greater control and greater political influence than they do now, that power would not be exercised in accordance with the general freedom that prevails in this country; and that neither in respect to political circumstances nor upon other subjects would they favour that general freedom of discussion and that activity and energy of the human mind that belong to the spirit of the constitution of this country. I do not think that in that respect they are upon a par with the Presbyterians of Scotland. The Presbyterians of Scotland, the Wesleyans of this country, and the Established Church of this country and of Scotland, all, no doubt, exercise a certain influence over their congregations; but that influence which they thus exercise over their congregations must be compatible with a certain freedom of the mind—must be compatible with a certain spirit of inquiry, which the ministers of these churches do not dare to overstep, and which, if they did overstep, that influence would be destroyed. I am obliged, then, to conclude—most unwillingly to conclude, but most decidedly—that the endowment of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland in the place of the endowment of the Protestant Church in that country, in connection with the State, is not an object which the Parliament of this country ought to adopt or to sanction. Sir, these opinions of mine may lead to conclusions unpalatable to many who belong to the Roman Catholic Church. They may lead to a persistence in a state of things that I quite admit to be anomalous and unsatisfactory; but I am obliged as a Member of this Parliament to consider—and to consider most seriously in the present state of the world—that which is best adapted to maintain the freedom and permanence of our Institutions. I must look around me at what is passing elsewhere. I must see what is taking place in Belgium. I must see what is taking place in Sardinia and in various countries of Europe. I must regard the influence which, if not exercised, has been attempted to be exercised in the United Kingdom of late years. Seeing these things, I give my decided resistance to the proposal of the hon. gentleman for the abolition of the Established Church in Ireland upon the principles which I have stated, and which appear to me to be conclusive against the motion.—

[3 *Hansard*, cxxvii. 945-6.]

Such continued to be the policy of the Cabinets with which he was connected during the life of Lord Palmerston. In 1863 Mr. Cardwell, then Irish Secretary, said on Mr. Bernal Osborne's motion:—

What the honourable gentleman really means is an abstract resolution of this House again condemning the Irish Church. I believe this House will not surrender the principle of an Established Church. I believe it will

not alienate the property of the Church from the ecclesiastical uses to which it has been devoted.

And in a subsequent session Sir Robert Peel, who had succeeded to the office of Chief Secretary, speaking on a similar motion, declared that the maintenance of the Irish Church Establishment was one of those questions on which the Government were determined to stand or fall. This was the policy of Lord Russell and his colleagues charged with the Irish Administration up to the time of their losing office. One statesman of the Party, indeed, the one who has most thoroughly studied Church questions, and who is at the same time the real and potential Liberal leader, had in 1865 indicated his decided divergence from his colleagues on this subject. No one will charge Mr. Gladstone with inconsistency at all events, should he declare that the time is ripe to deal with the Irish Church Question in 1868. But this is one of the points on which there is room to suspect that there is not exact accord between Mr. Gladstone and Lord Russell. Mr. Gladstone may, perhaps, look forward to the prospect of dealing some day or other with the Irish Church Question; but hardly from his present base of operations. It is a question for a strong Minister with a strong majority, and not a question for the discomfited leader of an incoherent Opposition in the last session of a perishing Parliament.

For these reasons we regard the expectations of its settlement held out for next year as sanguine at best; but, in so far as they are seriously entertained by persons responsible for the actual conduct of Irish public affairs, as dangerously delusive. After so many years of agitation and complaint, it remains to be said, indeed, that Irish Catholic opinion is far less ripe for its settlement than might be expected. There is a pretty general cry easy to evoke at any time of "Away with it! away with it!" But it is not possible for Parliament simply to enact a cry. The Established Church is an enormous public corporation, covering the country as completely as the Poor Law or the Police. It has a large property and a considerable revenue. Is the property to be sold like Italian or Mexican Church property for the benefit of the Commissioners of the National Debt? Is the revenue to simply cease to be levied, and so go into the pockets of the Irish landlords? This is the interpretation which a democratic Parliament, still leavened by a certain share of landlord influence, would probably put upon a mere popular cry for Abolition. But such a solution would evidently be eminently unsatisfactory, for the Irish Church property in the last resort is, at all events, the



property of the Irish people, and especially of the Irish Poor, and ought to be applied, as it was intended, to their peculiar benefit. Is, then, the Catholic Church, as the true Church of the country, to take it all, and to be established as the Church of England and the Church of Scotland are? Or a share of it, on the footing of the chief dissenting sect, leaving the precedence and rank of establishment to the Protestant Church, as is the case in the principal British colonies? Or, if the settlement be preceded by a solemn, self-dénying ordinance on the part of the Irish Catholic hierarchy and clergy, are the proceeds of the confiscation to be applied to the redemption of the Poor Rate or the endowment of Education—in the one case lightening the charge upon land, in the other relieving the Imperial Exchequer, for the sum is so large that it could not be applied in either way without ensuring to the immense benefit either of the landlords or of the State? Or can a fund be formed for the purchase of absentee properties and the creation of a peasant proprietary? or the settlement of waste lands? or the acquisition and extension of Irish railways? or some combination of several of these plans? Before Parliament seriously proceeds to legislate on the disendowment of the Irish Church, Parliament is entitled to know and will be certain to insist on knowing what the Catholics of Ireland really mean in the matter. And what they actually do mean—it may, without disrespect, be doubted whether they have as yet in any very deliberate way considered.

We are not ourselves sufficiently acquainted with the real sentiments of the Irish Episcopate and Clergy to speak with much confidence or freedom of the scheme so elaborately and so eloquently urged in the pamphlets, four of which have now been published by Mr. Aubrey de Vere. It is a scheme which ought to have gained their distinctly understood sanction, before any Minister could venture to propose it to Parliament. At present, any public declarations of the Irish Episcopate and Clergy which are on record would lead to the conclusion that they wish to remain absolutely independent of the State in point of income and endowment. But this particular plan of settlement, which is capable of being regarded as a restitution rather than an endowment, never has been formally considered, and deserves formal and careful consideration. We believe the time has not come, but is rapidly coming when this plan or some other plan, resting on an equally simple and intelligible principle, must receive their definite sanction. Meantime, the gratitude of the Irish Catholics is deeply due to Mr. de Vere for his thorough and enlightened investigation of the whole subject of their rela-

tions with the British State and Constitution. It would be difficult to praise too highly the zeal and care with which he has studied those relations, and the brilliant and energetic eloquence with which he has stated his conclusions. His papers are written throughout in a spirit and style befitting the disciple of that master of statesmen, Edmund Burke; and it is to be regretted that one so competent to deal with great questions of state is obliged to do so through newspaper letters and the restricted medium of the pamphlet, instead of from the place in Parliament which in any other country than Ireland would surely offer itself to his acceptance. When the Irish Church Question comes, as it necessarily must come, within a very few years, to be definitively settled, even though Mr. de Vere's scheme be not its accepted solution, his writings on the subject will assuredly have simplified its issues, and made the task of Parliament and the people comparatively clear and easy.

We do not profess to discuss his views at present in any degree of detail, because we believe that the settlement of the Irish Church Question is not a subject for next session; and the state of affairs in Ireland is so exceedingly grave and ominous that the topic presents itself to our mind rather in the character of a brilliant distraction. The question of to-day, for statesmen, for Parliament, for the Irish Clergy, and the Irish People, is, how to abolish Fenianism. We believe it is obvious enough to be assumed without argument, that if Mr. de Vere's plan were enacted into law within a week after the commencement of the next session, it would not have the faintest effect in alleviating the revolutionary propagandism from without, or checking the chronic disaffection within the country. It might tend to weaken the influence of the Catholic clergy, which has hitherto exercised the most effective control over the operations of the organization. But Fenianism is the result of a discontented emigration, which has acquired an abnormal political power in a country with hostile instincts, and grave causes of complaint against England,—reacting upon a population socially insecure and long misgoverned. It is not the Established Church which caused the emigration. Thirty years have passed since the personal payment of tithes has been exacted by law from the population which remains, nor, if the tithe-rent charge were abolished to-morrow, would its abolition make an appreciable difference in the rent of land throughout Ireland. In this sense, the Irish Church may be regarded as a “sentimental grievance.” Far be it from us to undervalue the pressure of sentimental grievances, sometimes the most intolerable to which man can be subjected,—

but the people of Ireland suffer from substantial grievances which are at present more galling, which are also more immediately remediable, and the settlement of which would, in our belief, more directly contribute to the present pacification of the country.

The first question to be settled in Ireland ought to be the Landlord and Tenant Question. It is eagerly denied by the members and organs of the Government that the Fenian movement is, in any considerable degree sympathized with by the Irish agricultural classes; and this statement is supported by the fact that very few farmers have been arrested under the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act. But, can it be doubted that there is a strong sympathy on the part of the great mass of the Irish population with Fenianism? Can it be doubted that this sympathy is as strong in districts which are purely and exclusively agricultural, as in the towns? Is it not the fact that the difference between the town and the country population in Ireland is less than that which exists between the same classes in any other country in the world? And has not the chief cause of discontent which the emigration carried with it to America been its sense of the injustice of the land laws, and its common experience of eviction? An Irish Bishop,—than whom no one has had more thorough experience of the operations of the Fenian organization,—and who has resisted its action with singular zeal and energy—we allude to the Bishop of Kerry—declared before a Committee of the House of Commons that, so deep-seated and so widely spread is disaffection among the mass of the Irish peasantry, that any foreign enemy of England, landing in Ireland, would be sure to receive their zealous support. It is not to suppress the parson, one may safely say, that the Irish peasant would take that risk, but to exterminate the landlord and the Government that lends its strong arm to execute the landlord's arbitrary will.

In our July number we expressed our apprehension that owing to the factious opposition of the Irish Liberal Members, the Government would be unable to proceed this year with its Landlord and Tenant Bills; and our regret that they had not been allowed to go into Committee, when, we believe they might easily have been shaped into a most beneficial and practical measure. But it may be fairly said, neither in the House nor in Ireland were those Bills considered on their actual merits,—yet their merits were great, their defects slight, and easily reparable. They were the first Bills proposed to Parliament, which gave the tenant power to create a property in improvements, even against the landlord's consent; which

established a fit and proper permanent umpire between the landlord and tenant; and enabled the tenant at once to effect all the improvements which his farm might require, with money borrowed from the State. It is true the Chief Secretary did not propose to restrain the landlord's power of eviction at the inception, or during the execution of improvements, even though they might be sanctioned by the Board of Works, and created by a Treasury loan. He doubtless hoped that both landlord and tenant would see their true interest in availing themselves of the financial aids offered by the State, to execute all over the country those solid agricultural works of which Ireland stands in such lamentable need. Instead of the patchwork repairs which the Irish tenant now makes in trembling insecurity, he was offered the money and the countenance of the State, to build, and drain, and reclaim; and, the impulse once given, it might naturally have been hoped that other moneys, now locked up on deposit in Joint Stock Banks, at one per cent., would have followed the money of the State, into the farmer's true bank—his land.

It seems to us that both the landlord and the tenant had a strong interest in the well-working of such a measure. Directly, and ultimately it is the landlord's estate which would be benefited. He is at present harassed by indefinite apprehensions of the course of legislation to which Parliament may be driven, if the condition of Ireland remains so troubled and disturbed as it now is, and if the English people should come to the conclusion, as they are fast coming, that the Irish landlords are mainly responsible for the plague of Fenianism. Already, advanced opinion in England points to a settlement of the Irish Land Question by plans borrowed from the Indian Government, such as, perpetual tenure at a fixed rent, or by compulsory purchase of absentee properties, and their sale in small allotments to peasant proprietors. Every year, nay, every month that a just and equitable settlement is delayed increases the danger that the Irish Land Question may be ultimately solved in some such arbitrary and simple manner. At all former times the Irish landlords might safely count on the sympathies of a Parliament mainly composed of men of their own order, and who regarded them as a garrison desperately defending the interests of the British Constitution and Church in the midst of a nation alien in blood, religion, and laws. But this has all changed. The Irish landlords are at present looked on with little favour by any class, even their own, in England. It is generally felt that they have not done their duty by their people, as English and Scotch landlords do theirs. Crowds of English travellers visit Ireland every

year, and have become aware of the harshness and rapacity with which Irish estates are, even still, too commonly administered; of the fact that as a rule, the Irish landlord never has made, and does not make those substantial agricultural improvements which the English and the Scotch landlord does, as a rule, make; and, that having allowed the tenant to make them, in such wretched fashion as they are habitually made, he is rarely tempted to give the tenant any compensating security of tenure, and is even not ashamed to tax the tenant in the form of increased rent, for the value which his industry has added to the land. Finally, English public opinion has become fully aware that the feeling of the Irish landlords, as a class, is to reduce Irish tenants, as a class, to the condition of tenants-at-will—a condition in some respects specifically worse than that of serfdom, and which is no more capable of being permanently maintained in the world, as the world is now governed, than serfdom. It seems to us that the bills of Lord Mayo, offering the intervention of the State, and the assistance of the State, were calculated, more wisely than any measure previously submitted to Parliament, to establish a new, common, and beneficial interest between the landlord and the tenant, of which the State would be the guardian and Parliament the natural protector. It was said that the landlords would, to a man, combine to prevent the beneficial operation of the proposed law. We cannot believe it, but are convinced that if they did so combine, it would be so much the worse for them. In one respect, in which, however, they were easily remediable, Lord Mayo's bills were defective. Some security of tenure ought to have been provided for the tenant, who, having obtained the consent both of his landlord and the State, should proceed to make solid improvements. He should be guaranteed the use and enjoyment, for a certain term, of those improvements. This, it may be said, would be an interference with freedom of contract, but the Irish land question is impossible of settlement if the standard to be applied to it is always to be the merely commercial side of political economy. Lord Mayo boldly set this aside when he proposed to give the tenant power to make a certain class of improvements with Treasury money, even against the expressed will of the landlord. But of what use to the tenant would have been such a provision if the landlord could have at once checkmated both the tenant and the Treasury by serving a notice to quit? We cannot believe that Lord Mayo was blind to such an obvious defect in the machinery of his measure, but it was a defect for which the cure would have been simple,

had the bills gone into Committee. If the State should feel itself warranted to advance public money to the tenant, in order to enable him to make agricultural improvements, even against the openly expressed opposition of the landlord, surely the State would be morally bound to prevent the landlord from victimizing the tenant, for an act in which it (the State) was equally responsible with the tenant, and equally interested. The fundamental principles of the bill were in this way capable of an extension which was, we think, little, if at all considered at the time. Under its provisions, the State would gradually have become the guardian of a vast new property, created in and on the soil, in which all its interest would have been with the tenantry, and yet in which it would not have been necessary to establish any new administrative machinery, or to incur any risk worth computation, in comparison with the risk of having to manage a country divided into two hostile and intractable classes. How far the easy government of the country would be facilitated by the operation of such a measure it is not difficult to foresee. In so far as it should operate it would give the tenant a common interest with the State: and a common interest with the State is, with the agricultural classes of every country in the world, the basis of the most conservative loyalty. The Irish farmer who had built a comfortable house, reclaimed a bit of bog, drained his meadow, and fenced his potato-ground with money lent him by the Treasury, on the recommendation of the Board of Works, would see the whole character and value of the government of the country in a very different light from the present discontented occupier, who regards the law as always on the side of the landlord, and knows that he has no more security in his holding than the fox has in his covert. How can the Irish tenant-at-will possibly feel any loyalty towards the system of government which keeps him in the state in which he is? In the very fact that they provided for the growth of an entirely new system of relations between the landlord, the tenant, and the State, Lord Mayo's Bills showed sound and masterly policy.

We hope, for the sake not merely of the aggrieved class, but for that of the general peace and good government of the country, that the next session of Parliament will not be so barren of result in this particular direction as the last session, and that which preceded it, were. The Land Question is one which can be by far more effectually dealt with by a Conservative than by a Whig Government. The authority of a Conservative Minister, when he proposes measures with that end, to a Parliament mainly composed of landlords, is greater



than that of the Minister who is identified with the party not supposed to favour landed privileges. Such a measure, if passed by a Tory Cabinet, would be more readily accepted as at least a political necessity, by the Irish gentry, the great majority of whom are Tories. They might conspire, as the present Lord Chief Justice of Ireland once threatened, in their name, that they would conspire, to render nugatory any such settlement carried by the Liberals. But a settlement carried by the Tories in the last session of the last unreformed Parliament would have very urgent claims on their consideration. They would, we believe, find it their interest and their policy to give it a generous and a thorough trial. The time is, indeed, peculiarly propitious of opportunity for legislation on the subject. Lord Clanricarde's Committee and the Bill, or rather code, which he submitted to the Upper House last session, has in a great measure prepared the Lords for bold and large legislation. There ought to be no difficulty if the Chief Secretary will introduce his measure sufficiently early next session in having it passed into law. But the great difficulty really is whether the Irish members of Parliament can raise themselves so far above mere party influences as to give any measures proposed by the present Government due consideration on their merits. And this, again, will depend on the question whether in the present state of Ireland any sound and serious public opinion can be formed on the subject during the recess. We regret to say we see no evidence that the subject is receiving as yet anything like that degree of attention which it deserves.

We have spoken of the question of a charter for the Catholic University as one, the solution of which is within reach. It is perfectly in accordance with the policy of the present Government to give a charter to the Catholic University. It is according to their precedents, for in 1852 they gave such a charter to the Catholic University of Canada. If we are not misinformed, they have already intimated their disposition to do the same in the case of Ireland, provided the boon should be acceptable to those to whom it is offered. It would relieve them from the serious difficulty in which they are placed by the extraordinary chain of circumstances (for which Irish Catholics can hardly feel sufficiently grateful to Divine Providence) by which the Supplementary Charter to the Queen's University was nullified. So far as Trinity College is concerned, a separate charter for the Catholic University seems to be the one available means of preserving its endowments for the exclusive use of the Irish Protestants. And this is an object to their interest in which Lord Derby's Irish

supporters are by no means blind. But it is a price which we believe all zealous Irish Catholics are willing to pay for the independence of their own University. The question, however, arises here, "Are the Irish Catholics really desirous of a charter for the Catholic University"? Considering the solemnity of the Pontifical Acts by which the University was founded; considering the enthusiasm and energy which were thrown into its first establishment; considering the almost intolerant indignation with which any lukewarmness in its regard, whether on the part of clerics or laymen, was visited; considering with what difficulties and at what sacrifices it has been maintained for the last fifteen years; it seems incredible that now when success is actually manifestly within reach, any faltering of will or ambiguity of language should be apparent on the part of public men undertaking to represent Catholic interests. Yet, it is said that intimations have been conveyed to the Government to the effect that a charter for the Catholic University is by no means desired, on the part of certain Catholics who conceive that they represent the class most interested in University education. They do not hesitate to declare their absolute hostility to any system of University education, so completely under sacerdotal influence as they suppose that of a Catholic University must inevitably be; and the Government is strongly urged to annex the Catholic University, as a necessary condition of its legal recognition, either to Trinity College or to the Queen's University. Such courses seem to us eminently disloyal and dishonourable. Having said what they have said, and done what they have done, for the establishment of a University system of their own, the Catholics of Ireland would be for ever disgraced if they should consent, on the very eve of success, to compromise its cause. But that cause is in serious danger now, from underhand manœuvres and secret communications, and it is full time, if, as we have no doubt whatsoever, the sentiments of the great majority of the hierarchy, clergy, and laity of Ireland are unchanged, that they should be made manifest to the Government, and to Parliament. The partisans of mixed education are numerous, zealous, and indefatigable. They are now becoming insolently intolerant of any system except their own, but they are in reality weak, as against the solid, conservative forces which, throughout the United Kingdom, are opposed to godless education; and the substantiation of the right of the Catholics of Ireland to a legalized denominational University would be a heavy blow and a great discouragement to all the interests of infidelity throughout the Empire. Herein Catholics

have a common cause with all the earnest members of all Christian sects, and especially with a very large segment of the Church of England. We repeat it, however, the present is a time in which, if they value their most sacred rights they cannot afford to remain any longer silent.

It is impossible to wonder at the dispirited condition of the Irish Catholics. Their politics are at present in a sad state of chaos. The inclinations of a large number of their most influential public men lead them to a desperate fidelity to the doubtful fortunes of the Liberal Party. The interests of the country, and Catholic interests in general, point to the policy of giving a fair trial to the present Government. Our own belief is, that the Irish Catholics are strong enough, if they chose to organize their strength, to be independent of either party, and to win their way by making each pay toll in its turn. A remarkable instance of what even one perfectly independent Member of Parliament can effect in this way, is furnished by Mr. M'Evoy's conduct in the question of the Repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, last session. When that question was first mooted it was regarded as well nigh desperate, and it will be remembered how, on the debate at its introduction, to the surprise of the House of Commons, a group of Catholic Liberal Members rose, one after another, to denounce the proposition as ill-timed and preposterous. Mr. M'Evoy, however, with a degree of courage and perseverance eminently creditable to him, contested the question, though his colleagues deserted him on every occasion when it was brought before the House. Ultimately, with the consent of the Government, Mr. M'Evoy got a Select Committee, and that Select Committee received a body of evidence of the most important character that has for many years been brought before Parliament on any Catholic question.

In the conduct of the Committee, the policy of the parties composing it again changed; the Conservatives, to a man, opposed the repeal of the Act; the Liberals steadily supported Mr. M'Evoy. The ultimate result was that the report condemned the Act, and recommended its repeal; and upon this point, though close divisions took place on all the clauses of the report, the Committee was practically unanimous. The one proposition of the report upon which they were unanimous was that which recommended that some legal designation should be devised for Roman Catholic bishops. In the appendix to the report an indication of the meaning of the Committee is given, in the Act of the Canadian Legislature, which recognizes the bishops of that country with the affix to their titles of "in communion with the

See of Rome." Such a recognition of Roman Catholic titles would, it is obvious, be an effectual repeal of the Act; and that Parliament is willing to go so far is, we take it, plain from the debates which occurred in both Houses. Legislation to this effect should be promptly pressed. We have already expressed the opinion, and we repeat it with a complete conviction that the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act is the natural, if not the necessary, preliminary to a more wholesome state of relations than at present exists between the Catholic Church and the Government of the United Kingdom; and it is also obvious that its repeal may be more easily expected from the present Government than from a Government of which Lord Russell is the head. There is a substantial agreement, we are informed, between the leaders on both sides of the House regarding the concessions to which Catholics are entitled in the administration of workhouses and prisons; yet this subject was hardly alluded to last session. Let us hope that not an hour of next session will be lost in its prosecution to a good issue, to whichever party the credit may redound.

Such, we think, are some of the results which might be achieved for Ireland, with a very ordinary degree of policy, next session, and which, if achieved, would make of it an Irish session indeed, though not quite in so wide a sense as Mr. Bright's. Any doubt that we have of the result arises from our doubt of the preliminary condition. The great mass of Irish Catholic members, and members representing Irish Catholic constituencies, seem wholly incapable of rising above, or even relaxing for a time, their present servile relation to the Liberal party. Yet we are probably approaching a period when it will be as impossible for a Catholic politician to retain the name of Liberal as it would have been for him at any time within the last forty years to avow himself a defender of the Protestant constitution, in Church and State. Two years ago we ventured to say that the great want of the time was a policy for Ireland on the part of British Statesmen, and on the part of Parliament a willingness to give effect to that policy. At present Statesmen abundantly see the necessity of having an Irish policy. Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Gladstone are equally alive to its importance, and Lord Russell has given testimony to the same purport. The willingness of Parliament to give effect to the measures of ministers will, however, in some degree depend on the attitude and conduct of the Irish members. At present we are afraid the general sense of Parliament is that they think far more of the smaller *tracasseries* of party, and the pursuit of little places and little titles, than of the great questions which are supposed to be convulsing

their country. Nor are they, with a very few exceptions, equal, in point of Parliamentary ability, to the exigencies of their position. No one would seriously compare the present generation of Irish members with that which entered Parliament under O'Connell and Sheil, or that which served with Lucas and Gavan Duffy, Sergeant Shee and Mr. Moore. Yet opportunities will come and go, useless to a country which does not know how to take advantage of them. The time is coming when the responsibility will rest on the Irish Catholics of considering whether it is not absolutely necessary for them very considerably to recast their representation. It is not adequate, either in talent or *morale*, to the statesman-like treatment of questions so grave as those involved in the present condition of Ireland. The principles of the Reform Bill, which will doubtless be extended to Ireland next session, will, we believe, immensely increase the political power of the Irish Catholics, and it is to be hoped, in their own true interest that they will employ it with wisdom and energy. The reason why Fenianism spreads so freely among the lower classes is because they have lost faith in Parliamentary politics ; and the reason why they have lost faith in Parliamentary politics is because they have gradually lost faith in the honour and honesty of almost all Parliamentary politicians. Fenianism could not have lived alongside of the Repeal Association, or of the Tenant League. The politics of conspiracy in Ireland always begin at the point where the peasant loses faith in the honour of public men. Why should not a great effort be made by those who really have the power and are responsible for the politics of Ireland, to improve the quality of its representation ? There are not wanting in that country men endowed by God with some of the most precious gifts and qualifications for the career of Parliament. If power given to the people is to be conscientiously exercised, it ought surely to be in placing such men where their talents could be made most useful for the service of their country, and the service of all good causes. So subtle and profound a thinker, one so gifted with a refined and scholarly eloquence, has not treated of the affairs of Ireland for many a year, as the gentleman whose latest pamphlet we have placed at the head of this article. In any other country but Ireland, and indeed, in Ireland, at any time except the present, it would be natural to expect that such a man should be designated to do honour to some constituency, by occupying in its name a seat in that Assembly where opinions so urged are rapidly transmuted into facts. In the West of Ireland, living on his patrimonial estate, there is an ostracised Irish politician, whose eloquence might, not unfitly, be compared with that of

Sheil, or indeed, in passages, with that of Grattan, and who, for ten years, ten years ago, with unblemished fidelity and unfaltering courage, had maintained the cause of Ireland in Parliament. What are the faults that even the calumny of faction can attach to the character of George Moore, that his country should be deprived of the benefit which it might derive from the exercise of his genius, and his gifts? As we write these lines another Irish politician of quite singular talents, and who, above all, seemed to be more than any Irishman of his generation, born to move in and to act on the air of Parliament, banished by his country, and banished by party, is leaving England, to govern for six years a tropical island. No three men could perhaps be found, offering more complete contrast of character, and, in some respects, less identity of views, than Mr. Aubrey de Vere, Mr. George Moore, and Mr. Pope Hennessy; but the country is poor that loses the services of such sons, and wretched if she loses them through the fault of those who wield her power in public affairs. An Irish Reform Bill will bring great opportunities to Ireland of increasing her political power at a time when English statesmen have come to the settled conclusion that they must have a wise and thorough policy for Ireland. The greatest opportunity of all that it will bring to her is the opportunity of purging her present representation.

---



## Notices of Books.

---

*Episcopal Address presented to the Holy Father at Rome.* July, 1867.

**T**HE Church is always and essentially One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic : and she is always visibly and conspicuously so, not only to those within her own fold, but to those without, who have eyes and who *will* to see with them. There are however times and seasons, when she exhibits one or more of these attributes to the world with peculiar significance and splendour. Unity in Catholicity—*Catholic* unity—the union of all her children over all the earth in one faith, in one worship, under the one Supreme Pastor—this is her great primary attribute ; the great root of all her strength and beauty ; the great sign, which, like the horned glory on the face of Moses, marks her out as the one true herald of Heaven to the wandering, way-worn, children of men. Never perhaps before, in any period of her past history, did all the gates of hell combine, as they have for the last twenty years combined, with such world-wide accordance, with such concentrated energy, with such intense malice, to war against this unity and to break it in pieces. However this may be, certain it is that never in any former age did the Church exhibit to the eyes of all men this very attribute of unity with an effulgence at once so bright, so purely bright, and so universal, as in the late centenary celebration at Rome.

The *Times'* correspondent, an avowedly and, indeed, ostentatiously staunch Protestant, wrote thus from Rome, on July 6 (*Times*, July 12):—"They came from all quarters of the globe . . . . By whatever means, however arranged, 43 cardinals, 500 bishops, and 20,000 priests have met together in Rome, of every rank, colour, and country . . . . have all met together under the influence of one common faith. The spectacle was grand ; the moral impression which it created, grander ; and I pity the man, whatever his creed, who could contemplate without deep feeling the sincere devotion, the undoubting faith, the pious exultation of so many thousands of his fellow-creatures." In a previous communication (July 2, *Times*, July 9) the same writer had noted more in detail the many sources of this extraordinary confluence :—"Of English [bishops] there are eight ; Scotch, three ; Irish, who came late, fourteen ; Austrian and Prussian Poland have sent two each ; Russian, none ; Hungary has sent the Primate ; France, Spain, and Italy have been represented by shoals. Portugal, too, has sent many. There are also bishops from Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland. Turning to the East, all its various rites are represented ; as Greeks, Melchites, Rumanians, Ruthen-

ians, Syrians, Chaldæans, Maronites, Armenians, and Copts. There are bishops, too, from India, China, and the islands of the Indian seas. So it may be said of the Americas ; Canada, the United States, Brazil, and the Federations of the North, Centre, and South of South America have all their pastors in Rome. Undoubtedly it is the greatest demonstration of the age."

As a demonstration of the Church's unity, it was the greatest, not only of the age, but of all the ages. From first to last, under every aspect, in all its elements and circumstances, it was absolutely perfect. It was a perfect image of the one living Church, mirrored under the dome of S. Peter's, without crease, or flaw, or stain ; and we cannot conceive how it could have been more perfect. Never before did such an assembly of the successors of the Apostles meet round the throne of the Prince of the Apostles or in any other part of the Church. In numbers, putting the Cardinals out of consideration, it more than doubled the great gathering of 1862. The great Councils of the Church can alone be compared with it : but, viewed in the light in which we contemplate it, as a universal and absolutely harmonious expression of unity, it stands alone and above them all. They were assembled by mandate or under strong pressure of some kind, to put down some new heresy or schism, or to reform abuses ; to make new definitions, new laws, new arrangements. The great centenary met by simple invitation, under no pressure whatever, save that of the Holy Spirit gently breathing and wafting on. They met, not to define, or legislate, or to do anything else, but simply to testify to the whole world, and in the very presence of the Holy Father, that unity of loving allegiance which, strong as death and stronger than hell, binds as if with a golden chain \* all tribes and tongues to the everlasting rock of Rome.

In two or three of the Councils a larger number of Bishops were assembled. About 600 bishops met in the Council of Chalcedon : but, with the exception of the Papal Legates who presided therein, they were all Eastern ; not a single Western bishop sat there. Then, those 600 formed not one-fourth part of the whole Episcopate. At present there are not 1,000 bishops in the whole Church ; and of these more than one-half met at the Centenary, and met from every corner of the earth. In the second Council of Lateran there were 1,000 bishops ; but they did not form more than one-fifth of the whole Episcopate as it existed then. There were not one hundred bishops at any one of the first sixteen sessions of the Council of Trent ; nor does it appear that fully 250 bishops were actually present at any of the subsequent sessions. Of these only six belonged to the Greek Church : all the rest were Western, more than two hundred of them from Italy, France, and Spain.

There are other features in the centenary which mark it out as distinct from any other episcopal assembly that ever met. But we think we have said enough to establish our proposition.

Not the least remarkable feature in the gathering was the singular distinctness with which, in addressing the Holy Father, the assembled bishops—thus brought together from every corner of Christendom—expressed their

---

\* Ὡσπερ χρυσὴν σείραν. Synodical Letter of the Council of Chalcedon to Pope Leo the Great.

judgment on the Church's infallibility. Their words are peremptory against Gallicanism on the one hand ; they are even more peremptory against minimism on the other. Their doctrinal pronouncement possesses under present circumstances an importance which it is difficult to exaggerate ; and it will be worth our while to exhibit in detail its drift and bearing.

The passage of their address to which we refer is as follows :—

Led by this faith and these feelings, Most Holy Father, we spoke before, when five years ago, standing around your throne, we rendered our due testimony to the sublime office you bear, and gave public expression to our prayers for you, for your civil principedom, and the cause of right and of religion. Led by this faith we then professed, both in words and writing, that nothing was nearer to us, nor dearer, than to believe and teach those things which you believe and teach ; than to reject those errors which you reject ; than to walk in the ways of the Lord with one mind, under your guidance ; to follow you, to labour with you, and with you to contend in the Lord's cause, at every risk and with whatever result. All these things, which we then declared, we now renew and confirm with the deepest filial piety ; and we desire to testify it to the whole world, gratefully remembering, also, and with fullest assent, all you have done from that time onward for the good of the faithful and the glory of the Church.

For, as Peter said long since, "We cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard." You have also held it to be a sacred and solemn duty ; you are giving manifest proof that you have never held it to be otherwise. For never has your voice been silent. You have accounted it to belong to your supreme office to proclaim eternal verities ; to smite with the sword of your Apostolic utterance the errors of the time, which threaten to overthrow the natural and supernatural order of things and the very foundations of ecclesiastical and civil power ; to dispel the darkness which perverse and novel teachings have shed over men's souls ; and to declare, persuade to, and approve all that is needful and wholesome to the individual, to the Christian family, and to civil society : so that at length all may attain to know what it is that every Catholic should hold, retain, and profess. For that exceeding great care we render to your Holiness the deepest thanks, and with endless gratitude ; and, believing that Peter has spoken by the mouth of Pius, therefore, whatsoever you have spoken, confirmed, and pronounced for the safe custody of the Deposit, we likewise speak, confirm, and pronounce ; and with one voice and one mind we reject everything which, as being opposed to Divine Faith, the salvation of souls, and the good of human society, you have judged fit to reprove and reject. For that is firmly and deeply established in our mind, which the Fathers at Florence defined in their decree on union, that the Roman Pontiff "is the Vicar of Christ, head of the whole Church, and father and teacher of all Christians ; and that to him, in the person of blessed Peter, has been committed by our Lord Jesus Christ full power to feed, to rule, and to govern the universal Church."\*

---

\* Hâc fide, hisce sensibus ducti loquebamur olim, Beatissime Pater ! cùm ante quinquennium tuo throno adstantes sublimi tuo ministerio debitum testimonium dedimus, votaue pro te, pro civili tuo principatu, pro justitiæ ac religionis causâ palam nuncupavimus. Hâc fide ducti verbis scriptoque eo tempore professi sumus, nihil nobis potius et antiquius esse, quàm ut quæ tu ipse credis ac doces, nos quoque credamus et doceamus, quos rejicis errores, nos item rejiciamus. Te duce unanimes incedamus in viis Domini, te sequamur, tibi adlaboremus ac tecum pro Domino in omne discrimen for-

It will be found on careful consideration, that in this passage the bishops express three momentous truths, which we will consider in order. And firstly, they declare that during the last five years Pius IX. has put forth a considerable number of instructions *ex cathedrâ*. There are four different arguments, which evince that this is their distinct and unmistakeable proposition.

(1.) Pius IX., they say, has been "smiting with the sword of Apostolic utterance" "the errors of the time;" has been declaring, according to the duty "of his supreme ministry, those things which are needful and wholesome to the individual, to the Christian family and to civil society;" he has been speaking "in order that all may attain to know what *every Catholic should hold*;" he has been "speaking, confirming, and pronouncing" various truths "for the safe custody of the Deposit;" he has been "reproving and rejecting" various errors as "opposed to Divine faith, the salvation of souls, and the good of human society." But these various things he does in his capacity of *Universal Teacher*, and in no other capacity whatever.

(2.) By the mere fact of expressing adhesion to his pronouncements, the assembled bishops declare that he put forth those pronouncements *ex cathedrâ*. They "speak, confirm, and pronounce" whatsoever has been "spoken, confirmed, and pronounced" by him; they reject all those things "which he has judged worthy to reprove and reject." That is to say, they teach each to his own diocese what the Pope has taught to the Universal Church. Their words will bear no other meaning.

(3.) They further express their conviction, that in all these things "Peter

tunamque parati decertemus. Cuncta hæc quæ tunc declaravimus, nunc denuo piissimo cordis sensu confirmamus, idque universo orbi testatum esse volumus; grato simul recolentes animo, plenoque laudantes assensu, quæ à te in salutem fidelium et Ecclesiæ gloriam ab eo quoque tempore gesta fuerunt.

Quod enim Petrus olim dixerat "non possumus quæ vidimus et audivimus non loqui." Tu pariter sanctum et solemne habuisti, ac nunquam non habere luculenter demonstras. Non enim unquam obticuit os tuum. Tu æternas veritates annunciare, tu sæculi errores, naturalem, supernaturalemque rerum ordinem atque ipsa ecclesiasticæ civilisque potestatis fundamenta subvertere minitantes, Apostolici eloquii gladio configere, tu caliginem novarum doctrinarum pravitate mentibus offusam dispellere, tu quæ necessaria ac salutaria sunt tum singulis hominibus, tum Christianæ familiæ tum civili societati intrepidè offerri, suadere, commendare supremi tui ministerii es arbitratus; ut tandem cuncti assequantur, quid hominem Catholicum tenere, servare ac profiteri oporteat. Pro quâ eximiâ curâ maximas Sanctitati Tuæ gratias agimus, habituri sumus sempiternas; Petrumque per os Pii locutum fuisse credentes, quæ ad custodiendum Depositum à te dicta, confirmata, prolata sunt, nos quoque dicimus, confirmamus, annuntiamus; unoque ore atque animo rejicimus omnia, quæ divinæ Fidei, saluti animarum, ipsi societatis humanæ bono adversa, tu ipse reprobanda ac rejicienda judicasti. Firmum enim menti nostræ est, alteque defixum, quod Patres Florentini in decreto unionis unanimes definiverunt: Romanum Pontificem "Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum Patrem et Doctorem existere, et ipsi in Beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi Universalem Ecclesiam à Domino Nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse."

has spoken by the mouth of Pius :” the well known ecclesiastical phrase for saying “Pius has spoken *ex cathedrâ*.”

(4.) They found their assent to Pius IX.’s teaching on the Florentine definition that the Pope is “teacher of all Christians.” It is in his capacity then of Universal Teacher, that he put forth those utterances to which they express adherence.

Further, the bishops speak of these instructions as having been very frequent. “Never has your voice been silent.” Yet during the last five years there have been no definitions of faith and no dogmatic Bulls ; the Pope has issued his instructions by way of Encyclical, Allocution, or Apostolic Letter. The bishops therefore declare that a large number of instructions are *ex cathedrâ*, which have been issued by way of Encyclical, Allocution, or Apostolic Letter. And this is the first particular to which we would draw attention.

Secondly, they express their own hearty *assent* to these instructions : “We pronounce what you have pronounced ; we reject what you have rejected.”

Thirdly, this assent does not arise from their own independent judgment on the various relevant questions, but from unreserved intellectual submission to the Holy Father’s infallible authority. We assent “*for*,” i. e. “*because*,” “that is fairly and deeply established in our mind which the Fathers at Florence defined, that the Roman Pontiff is the Teacher of all Christians.”

If then it be borne in mind that these formal Episcopal addresses, like the Papal utterances themselves, never use the word “infallible,”—it will be admitted that no more distinct and unmistakeable expression of doctrine can easily be imagined. Its meaning is unmistakable, whether in contrast to the Gallican opinions, or to that blighting error of minimism which just now in England constitutes so fearful a peril.

The Holy Father, in his answer, begins with assuring them that their “noble” assent to his teaching is no more than “was to be expected from their faith and devotion ;” that nevertheless this assent is very pleasing (*per-jucunda*) to him ; and that their present united *expression* of such assent is more pleasing still. He adds that the teaching in question had been caused by his “pastoral solicitude ;” and had been directed to the purpose of “spreading abroad the light of truth ; dispelling the darkness of error ; warding off destruction from redeemed souls.” He repeats then, in effect, what they had already said ; viz., that he had put forth these various instructions in his capacity of Universal Teacher.

When Pope and bishops thus unite before the whole world to declare Christian doctrine, “he who hath ears to hear let him hear.”

*Letter from the Holy Office on Heathen Classics.*

AS we have on one or two occasions spoken of certain dangers as to be apprehended from any exaggerated attention being given to classical studies, it is our bounden duty to place before our readers the following authoritative decision on one part of the subject. It is addressed to the Bishop Administrator of Quebec, by Cardinal Patrizi in the name of the Holy Office.

Feb. 15, 1867.

From your letter dated Nov. 23 of last year, the most Eminent Cardinals who, with me, preside over the Sacred Inquisition, have understood with much regret that grave dissensions have arisen and are still rife in your diocese, especially among ecclesiastics, because in teaching polite literature—whether in the diocesan seminary or in other colleges committed to your supervision and authority—books are read which were written by heathen authors, though expurgated. There is really no cause why those who think that such books had better be removed from the course of study, should be vehemently solicitous and anxious on the matter. For it is an established principle, and one approved by ancient and constant custom, that youths, even clerical, may most legitimately without any peril learn appropriate elegance and eloquence in speaking and writing, whether from the wisest works of the Holy Fathers, or from the most illustrious heathen writers cleansed from all stain [of impurity.] This practice is not tolerated only by the Church, but entirely permitted; as was clearly declared by our most holy Lord Pius IX., in an Encyclical addressed to the French bishops on March 21, 1853. Since therefore those ancient books written by heathens in Greek or Latin, which are used in the seminary and in such colleges, are not those which treat lascivious or obscene subjects;—nay, since they have been most diligently cleansed from every [such] stain, as you expressly state;—there is nothing therefore in the use of such books which can be justly reprehended. But one thing is greatly to be lamented; viz., that on this account the concord of the clergy has been disturbed and their minds in no small degree excited: for if always, surely at the present time especially, Catholics, and particularly Ecclesiastics, should devote all their labour and industry, not to agitating and fomenting unseasonable controversies, but to protecting Catholic truth and upholding the rights of that holy Church which is so harassed [on every side]. Wherefore this holy congregation earnestly exhorts you in the Lord, that with earnestness no less than with pastoral charity you would admonish these ecclesiastical men to be harmoniously united, and to be perfected in the same sense and the same judgment: and that you would effect that [your clergy] carefully avoiding all vain questions, shall labour actively and earnestly for God and their fellow men.\*

---

\* Die 15 Februarii 1867.

“*Illustris ac Reverendissime Domine uti frater.*—Ex tuis literis die 23 Novembris anno proximè elapso ad me datis, Eminentissimi Patres Cardinales unà mecum Sacrae Inquisitioni praepositi aegre admodum intellexerunt, graves in ista dioecesi obortas esse et adhuc commoveri dissensiones inter viros potissimum ecclesiasticos, propterea quia in tradendis humanioribus litteris, tum in Seminario dioecesano tum in aliis puerorum iuvenumque



Here is precisely, as we understand the matter, the doctrinal decision of a Pontifical congregation, such as Pius IX. mentions in his Munich Brief ; and we at once profess therefore that we accept its teaching *ex animo* as a true exposition of Catholic doctrine. We understand its drift as follows :—

Certain Catholics have considered that heathen literature cannot be used without peril in schools and colleges, even when entirely expurgated from impurity, and even when exclusively employed for æsthetical purposes ; for acquiring “elegance and eloquence in speaking and writing.” They have thought that even if used for this purpose alone, so much of the heathen spirit which animates that literature would unconsciously leaven the student’s mind, as to constitute a real religious peril. They never doubted of course, that such peril could be averted by carefully chosen safeguards ; but they have thought that it really exists. We are not aware that we have ourselves ever expressed this opinion ; but we have undoubtedly been inclined to hold it. Now that the Congregation has spoken, we hold it no longer.

This, neither more nor less, seems to us the opinion condemned. Every Catholic, we imagine, has still the fullest liberty to account it a serious peril,

collegiis vigilantiae atque auctoritati tuae commissis, libri ab ethnicis auctoribus conscripti, licet emendati, praeleguntur. Non est profectò, cur qui huiusmodi libros a litterarum studiis amandandos existimant, hac in re vehementer sollicitos anxiosque se praebeant. Explorata enim res est et antiquâ constantique consuetudine comprobata, adolescentes etiam clericos germanam dicendi scribendique elegantiam et eloquentiam, sive ex sapientissimis Sanctorum Patrum operibus sive ex clarissimis ethnicis scriptoribus ab omni labe purgatis, absque ullo periculo addiscere optimo iure posse. Id ab Ecclesiâ non toleratur modo, sed omninò permittitur, ut a SSmo Domino Nostro Pio Papa IX. perspicuè declaratum fuit in epistolâ encyclicâ ad Galliarum Episcopos die 21 Martii 1853 missâ. Quum igitur antiqui libri ab ethnicis graecè aut latinè conscripti, qui in seminario et collegiis istis adhibentur, non ii nimirum sint, qui res lascivas seu obscenas tractant, narrant, aut docent,—imà ab omni labe sint iam diligentissime expurgati, sicuti insigni testimonio tuo ultrò fateris,—idcirco nihil est quod in usu huiusmodi librorum iure possit reprehendi. Verumtamen illud maxime dolendum est, quòd hanc ob causam, disturbatâ isthic cleri concordia, non parùm commoti sint animi : quia si semper, nunc certè viri catholici, prasertim ecclesiastici, non in agitandis iovendisque importunis controversiis, sed in catholicâ tuendâ veritate et in Sanctae Ecclesiae juribus quæ adeo divexatur propugnandis omnem operam et industriam debent impendere. Quare te maximopere Sacra haec Congregatio in Domino cohortatur, ut non minori contentione quàm pastoralis caritate ecclesiasticos istos viros concordissimis animis idipsum dicere omnes et in eodem sensu atque in eâdem sententiâ perfectos esse moneas ; atque efficias, ut ab omni quæstionum vanitate abhorrentes, sedulò naviterque Dei et proximorum negotium agant. Non dubitatur, quin pro spectatâ tuâ prudentiâ à procurando hoc salutari officio unquam desinas ; et interim fausta cuncta ac felicia tibi precor à Deo.”

Romæ die 13 Februarii 1867.

Amplitudini Tuæ

Addictissimus uti frater,

C. Card. PATRIZI.

R. P. D. Episcopo Administr. Apost. Dioecesis Quebecensis.

if heathen works are used as text books of philosophy or history. Indeed, as to the former, we suppose they are not so used in any Catholic college whatever.

We have ourselves more than once (see e. g. April, 1867, pp. 507, 8) expressed our cordial concurrence with a lecture delivered in Rome by the Bishop of Aquila, in one very important particular. We refer to the necessity which exists in modern times for a "religious instruction" far more "solid, extended, substantial" than was requisite when society was Christian. And we have expressed a doubt whether this end can be duly achieved, without giving a far less prominent place to heathen classics than that commonly assigned to them. We have no wish at this moment to say more on the subject. We would only point out—what is very evident—that whether this opinion be well or ill founded, it is simply and absolutely external to the congregational decree recited above.

---

*Révue des Questions Historiques.* Livraison v., article 2. Paris : Palmé.

THIS is M. de l'Épinois's long-promised article on Galileo. We have thought it better however to defer, until January, our own treatment of the question with reference to F. Ryder's pamphlet, because those portions of that pamphlet on which we comment in our present number are far more primary and momentous. But we must not delay for another quarter to express our cordial thanks to M. de l'Épinois for his most kind mention of our own humble labours in the matter, and to add that the various facts which he has brought together, have but confirmed our conviction as to the substantial truth of that whole view which we expressed in October, 1865.

We will here only say a few words on the case of Copernicus. We doubt whether M. de l'Épinois has laid sufficient stress on the indubitable fact, that that writer did not prominently profess belief in the *truth* of his theory, but quite the contrary. As we mentioned in our article, he prefixed a preface to his work, which declared that he intended throughout to speak of Heliocentrism as a mere hypothesis "which need not be true nor even probable." Prof. De Morgan tells us that with one single exception all Copernicus's followers, to the time of Galileo, understood him to represent his propositions "only as mathematical principles feigned not as philosophical truly averred." Galileo in his judicial interrogation (*Révue*, pp. 161–2) quotes both Bellarmine and the Congregation itself as having thus understood Copernicus. It is true that on a careful examination of Copernicus's work certain passages were discovered of a different tenour; and the reading of that work was therefore prohibited until those passages were corrected, as was done (*Révue*, p. 100) in the year 1620. But these objectionable passages, De Morgan tells us, "were very few in number;" and the general impression conveyed by the work was undoubtedly (in the words of Copernicus's own Preface) that he only alleged his theory as an hypothesis "which fulfilled the object of

submitting the orbits of the heavenly bodies more conveniently to calculation."

We also quoted Professor De Morgan in our former article to show how very little Copernicus's investigations tended to prove the truth of his hypothesis. It is not at all too much to say that in his hands Heliocentrism was a mere guess ; a mere conjecture.

It is very important to bear the facts in mind. On February 26th, 1666 ("Révue," p. 98, note 2), "the Commissary" of the Holy Office "*in the name of our Holy Father the Pope* and the whole congregation of the Holy Office commanded and ordered the aforesaid Galileo *entirely to abandon* the above mentioned opinion, that the sun is centre of the universe and immoveable, and *that the earth moves* ; and hereafter in no manner to *hold*, teach, or defend that opinion by word or writing, *otherwise proceedings will be taken against him before the Holy Office.*" Galileo himself protested to the Holy Office in 1633 ("Révue," p. 165) that he had never himself held the Copernican theory as true ; and produced a letter from Bellarmine to testify that he (Galileo) had never been called on to retract "any of his opinions or ideas"\* ("Révue," p. 128). From the year 1616 to the year 1757 no Catholic was permitted by the successive Popes publicly to express belief in the Copernican theory. And it is well known, indeed, that so late as the year 1741 the two religious who edited Newton's "Principia" avowed their dutiful obedience to this prohibition :—"We declare that we obey the decrees that have been made by the *Supreme Pontiffs* against the motion of the earth."

Now nothing will appear more intelligible, nor, indeed, more reasonable, than the Church's whole procedure, if only the facts of the case are rightly apprehended. "It was not till towards the year 1750," says M. de l'Épinois ("Révue," p. 143), that scientific men were pretty well unanimous in considering the scientific proof of Copernicanism complete ; and nothing short of complete scientific proof could justify Christians in deserting the one obvious and the one traditional sense of Scripture. But once let it be supposed that a century before Galileo's time Copernicus had been permitted publicly to advocate the truth of Heliocentrism, and freely make proselytes to that opinion, we do not see how the Church's conduct can be defended. We do not see how on *that* supposition she can be defended against a charge, on the one hand of violent inconsistency, and on the other hand of tyrannical repression.

---

\* We quoted this letter in our former article.

*Romanus Pontifex tanquam Primas Ecclesiæ et Princeps Civilis, e monumentis omnium sæculorum demonstratus.* Auctore AUGUSTINO DE ROSKOVÁNY, Episcopo Nitriensi. Nitriæ et Comaromii, 1867. Typis Fratrum Siegler.

**F**IVE goodly volumes of original documents and evidences concerning the Ecclesiastical Primacy and Civil Princedom of the Holy See are sure to be received eagerly by students of theology and ecclesiastical history. Such collections, even when they include no hitherto unpublished materials, as in the present case, are of the greatest value, not only because they bring together matter nowhere else to be found in one place, but also because they bring within general reach documents which existing only in great and costly works are utterly closed to those who have not access to a large library.

The learned Hungarian Prelate to whom we owe this publication has for more than thirty years employed his pen in various works for the defence of the Holy See and of ecclesiastical liberty ; particularly in a collection of monuments in several volumes, entitled "*Monumenta Catholica pro independentia Potestatis Ecclesiasticæ ab Imperio Civili*," published in 1847.

The present collection consists of two parts. The first four volumes refer to the Supremacy of the Holy See, the last to the Civil Princedom. Mgr. Roskovány has brought together no fewer than 1,254 documents in the first series, and 918 in the second. Besides the great collections of Councils, the Bullarium, and Migne's *Cursus* of the Fathers, he has laid under contribution an immense number of sources including Mai's *Spicilegium Romanum*, and other collections, Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta Slavorum*, *Vetera Monumenta Hungariæ*, *Codex Diplomaticus*, &c., the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, and numerous Collections of Local Councils.

We regret to notice a circumstance which we must consider a serious blemish in the first volume, and a great drawback to its utility—the insertion without note or warning of doubtful and spurious documents. Thus in the first century, after a passage from S. Clement's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, which is of unassailable authenticity, and which was even read like the Holy Scriptures in the Offices of the Church, and is still to be seen bound up with the inspired Books in ancient codices, come extracts in exactly the same type, and without any remark, from the spurious Epistles to S. James, to all bishops, and to the disciples at Jerusalem. A spurious work may be very valuable as an illustration of the current ideas of the time from which it dates, but the reader should be warned of its nature. A little further we find several documents purporting to be from S. Anacleto ; among others a decree concerning the obligation of bishops to visit the Limina of the Apostles. On turning to Coustant we find this a genuine decree of the Holy See, but really belonging to a period six centuries later. It is a Canon of a Roman Council under Pope Zachary. The reader turns over page after page and finds rather unexpectedly downright and explicit declarations of the Papal authority, but discovers on inquiry that the com-

piller has copied into his book every passage on his subject from the false decretals.

Moreover, the genuine is hopelessly mixed up with the doubtful or the spurious. The first two epistles of S. Pius I. quoted from are genuine, the next two doubtful. The first passage from Pope S. Julius I., is both genuine and very important, the two following are the work of Isidore. The first two of S. Liberius are worthless, the last is authentic. Passages from a number of epistles of S. Damasus follow one another, some of which are true and some false. The result is that down to the date of S. Siricius, A.D. 398, it is simply impossible to use Mgr. Roskovány's book without reference to some critical authority at every page and paragraph. Of course the author had no idea of offering doubtful or spurious for genuine writings, and indeed, in the introduction to the fifth volume, he calls attention to the course he has pursued :—

“As in reviewing the monuments concerning the Primacy, we have not attempted to write the history of these monuments, but have only produced them century after century, and left them to speak for themselves, so in setting forth the documents on the Civil Principedom of the Roman Pontiffs we do not mean to write history or dissertations, but only exhibit them in their chronological order. . . . We commence the series from the fourth century, in which Pope Melchiades celebrated the munificence of the Emperor Constantine, and the Donation of Constantine was made ; although critics place these documents among spurious writings.”

It would certainly, however, be well, in the case of a second edition of the work, to remedy this defect, either by foot-notes pointing out the spurious or doubtful character of the documents, or, more simply still, by printing them in a different type.

After all, however, the blemish we have pointed out affects only a portion of one volume. The whole collection cannot but prove of the greatest value. We cannot imagine, for instance, a Unionist not being powerfully affected by this great stream of evidence as to the historical position of the Holy See in Christianity—a stream uninterrupted from age to age, growing in volume but visibly one, traceable to the time of the Apostles, till it is seen in the pages of Holy Scripture issuing from the Rock which is Christ.

We shall not attempt, in the limits of this short notice, to single out among such a mass particular documents for notice. We may, however, mention that the series of papers relating to the Great Schism of the East has a special interest, and strikingly exhibits the ceaseless efforts of the Sovereign Pontiffs for the reconciliation of the schismatical bodies, and the frequent though sterile admissions by their bishops of the rights of the Holy See.

We would also call special attention to an interesting series of declarations by the Bishops of France in the 17th century, conclusively showing how entirely novel amongst them were the doctrines enunciated in 1682 ; amongst others a condemnation, in 1639, of a book maintaining the so-called Gallican Liberties, which it stigmatises as “servitutes potius quam libertates.”

The third volume contains a few documents, or : s of documents, on our English controversies about the oath to be ex ed as a condition of

Catholic emancipation. The selection, however, is by no means complete. The author has missed, for instance, one important document, the bearing of which on recent discussions we are rather surprised has not drawn attention to it. This is the retractation which was required by the Holy See of Bishop Berington, Milner's predecessor, as a condition of his receiving the usual extraordinary faculties of a Vicar Apostolic. The conclusion of it runs thus :—"And I profess that I submit myself with a willing and truly sincere mind to the judgment of the Holy See, and do embrace (*amplecti*) and will embrace all the dogmatical decisions (*dogmaticas decisiones*) which have hitherto come forth or shall hereafter come forth from it." (See "Milner's Supplementary Memoirs," p. 96, note.)

The documents of the present century are, of course, very numerous and very important. It is interesting to see amongst acts of older and greater Churches the words of our own First Provincial Council. Nothing can be more touching than the strength and universality throughout every part of the Church of loyal devotion to the prerogatives of the Holy See which is here apparent.

We must not omit to mention that a good half of Mgr. Roskovány's work is taken up with a voluminous appendix to each volume containing chronological lists of all the literature of the subject in each century, divided into works for and works against the Church. This is really an extraordinary bibliographical achievement, giving particulars of no less than 30,000 works, great and small.

We shall conclude by calling attention to a remarkable document given at p. 569, vol. i., headed "*Sententia Conc. Constantiensis, A. 1414, SS. de auctoritate Summi Pontificis in rebus fidei.*" In the censura of certain propositions of Wicklyffe, given under this title, we find a declaration that "it is impossible that the Apostolic See . . . in the office of defining and determining concerning every Catholic and Ecclesiastical matter (*circa universam materiam Catholicam et Ecclesiasticam*) and exterminating contrary errors, should determine and hold for Catholic and right faith anything which was not right faith." And again, that "the Apostolic See and the Roman Church have the same authority *in universa materiâ Catholicâ et Ecclesiastica* of recognizing and defining what things are true and Catholic, what false and erroneous, what good and eligible, as had the Apostles, priests, and elders then at Jerusalem." The words are remarkable in their bearing on the recent discussions about the object of the Church's infallibility. This censura is not given in Hardouin or Mansi. It is here taken from Van der Hardt's *Acta Concilii Constantiensis*.

---

*Bulletino di Archeologia Cristiana*, del Cav. G. B. De Rossi. May and June, 1856.

WE have frequently had occasion to call our readers' attention to this valuable record of Cav. De Rossi's researches, but perhaps no number of the *Bulletino* has yet appeared so interesting to Catholics in general as that which forms the subject of the present notice. In it the learned author



gives an accurate description, from careful personal observation, of the "Chair of S. Peter," which by command of the Holy Father was exposed for the veneration of the faithful during the recent solemnities, after having been hidden from view for two hundred years, and only known by the reports of those who had seen it before Alexander VII. enclosed it in the great bronze monument which overhangs the *Altare della Cattedra di S. Pietro*.

Cardinal Wiseman, in his able exposure of Lady Morgan's blunder, had given, from historical documents, an account of this celebrated Chair, of the truth of which every one who was present at the Canonization could satisfy himself by ocular demonstration. The Cav. De Rossi cannot, however, agree with the Cardinal in attributing the whole of what now appears to the age in which S. Peter lived. A personal examination, which the Cardinal had not the advantage of making, convinces him, that while the Chair itself may well belong to the time of Claudius, the ornaments are manifestly of a different date, and archæological exactness requires that they should be set down to a period not earlier than the fifth century. A description of the relic itself will make this clear.

The Chair is of the kind called "*sella gestatoria*," in which the senators began to be carried precisely at the time of Claudius. The four legs are square pillars, in which are fastened the rings for the poles, by means of which it was carried on men's shoulders. These legs, and the horizontal bars which connect them together, as also the two bars of the back, are all light yellow oak decayed by age, and bearing marks of having suffered from the pious depredations of those who chipped off particles as relics. These portions are destitute of any ornament. The spaces, however, between the legs in front and at the side, as well as the back, are all ornamented and strengthened by pieces of quite another kind of wood, a dark acacia, which has been scarcely touched by the hands of relic-hunters. A further indication of difference of date is supplied by the architectural style of the side-faces (as they were in the time of the writer whom Cardinal Wiseman followed, for they are now destroyed) and of the back, which is formed of a triangular panelling over a portico of arches springing from pillars with fluted capitals. This style belongs decidedly to Christian times. These more modern portions of the Chair are adorned with two kinds of ivory ornaments. Narrow bands with arabesques carved in relief in a heavy style, which De Rossi considers more recent than the fifth century, run round the edges of the back and panel; while the flat space between the two front legs is covered with ivory plates divided into small squares, on which are engraved, with thin strips of gold let into the cutting, figures representing the labours of Hercules. These, though more ancient than the arabesques, are still long posterior to the time of Claudius.

Now, while the battle between Paganism and Christianity was still raging, it is next to impossible that these figures of Hercules could have been permitted to remain intact. In the Roman Catacombs we may see numberless instances in which the early Christians carefully defaced all idolatrous figures on the marbles which they used for their own purposes. But, when Paganism had ceased to be a living power, in the early Middle Ages, we constantly find Gospels, Reliquaries, &c., ornamented with ancient ivories,

without any regard to the figures carved on them. On this very Chair some of the figures appear upside down, a clear proof of the ornaments having been put on at a later date, and of their not having formed part of the original Chair.

These observations of De Rossi's remove every archaeological difficulty in the way of believing this Chair to have belonged to the Prince of the Apostles. But perhaps the most interesting part of his treatise, is the historical investigation by which he carries the history of this very Chair up to within a century of S. Peter's martyrdom. It appears that, down to the time of Paul IV., this Chair was solemnly exposed on the 22nd of February; that for many ages the Pope used to sit in it at the High Altar on that day, as well as on the day of his enthronization; and that in the sixth century it was to be seen in the Baptistery of the Vatican, where it had been placed by S. Damasus. Ennodius of Pavia introduces Rome congratulating herself on having become Christian, and saying: "*Ecce nunc ad gestatoriam sellam Apostolicæ Confessionis uda mittunt limina candidatos; et uberibus, gaudio exactore, fletibus collata Dei beneficio dona geminantur.*" Here we have the Pope conferring the second Sacrament of Confirmation on the white-robed neophytes who come from the font to the *sella gestatoria*, in which he sits near the "Confession" of S. Peter. Ennodius wrote at the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century.

In the Codex of Verdun, probably of the fourth or fifth century, are given the verses inscribed on the walls of the Vatican Baptistery:—

"Sumite perpetuam sancto de gurgite vitam;  
Cursus hic est fidei, mors ubi sola perit.  
Roborat hic animos divino fonte lavacrum,  
Et dum membra madent, mens solidatur aquis.  
Auxit Apostolicæ geminatum Sedis honorem,  
Christus et ad coelos hunc dedit esse viam;  
Nam cui siderei commisit limina regni  
Hic habet in templis altera claustra poli.  
Istic insontes coelesti flumine lotas  
Pastoris Summi dextera signat oves.  
Huc undis generate veni, quo sanctus ad unum  
Spiritus ut capias te sua dona vocat."

A comparison of these lines with the passage from Ennodius shows that in the fifth century the Supreme Pontiff sealed the newly-baptized with the gifts of the Holy Ghost in the Baptistery, and that *sedes Apostolica* is not used here merely in its moral, but also in its physical and literal sense, as denoting the material Chair of the Apostle.

This is confirmed by the inscription put up by S. Damasus on the Font of the Vatican Baptistery erected by him towards the close of the fourth century, one line of which is:—

"Una Petri sedes, unum verumque lavacrum."

Again, in the epitaph of Siricius, the immediate successor of S. Damasus, we read—

"Fonte sacro magnus meruit sedere sacerdos."

Now, as the usual throne of the Bishop was in the apse of the basilica, this verse is inexplicable unless we understand it to refer to that venerable Chair placed by S. Damasus in the Baptistry, and to which the Bishop of Rome owed his pre-eminence and his title of *sacerdos magnus*.

During the pontificates of S. Damasus and of S. Siricius, S. Optatus of Milevis wrote against the Donatists, and replied to their boast of having a bishop of their sect in Rome, by enumerating the series of Roman Pontiffs from S. Peter to S. Siricius, all occupiers of the same Chair; and continued: "In fact, if Macrobius (the Donatist bishop) be asked where he sits in Rome can he say, in the Chair of Peter in *Cathedra Petri*? quam nescio si vel oculis novit, et ad cujus memoriam non accedit quasi schismaticus" (ad Parmen. ii. 4).

Before S. Damasus placed this well-known Chair in the Vatican Baptistry, it must have existed in the crypt of the Tomb of S. Peter or elsewhere. We find it alluded to in the poem against Marcion, a work of the third century, which gives a list of the Roman Pontiffs, commencing thus:—

"Hac cathedra, Petrus *qua sederat ipse*, locatum  
Maxima Roma Linum primum *considerare* jussit."

In fact, with the light of the preceding evidence to guide us, we shall not be rash in concluding that S. Cyprian spoke of this very Chair when he wrote: "Cum locus Fabiani, id est locus Petri et gradus Cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret" (Ep. 52). And when Tertullian (De Præscr. c. 36) challenges all heretics: "Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsident . . . Si Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam," the expression *ipsa cathedra* points to the existence of the visible monument of their Apostolic founders. In c. 32 the same author writes: "Romanorum (Ecclesia) Clementem a Petro ordinatum edit," while the ancient catalogues place Linus and Cletus before Clement. This shows the antiquity of the story inserted in the *Liber Pontificalis*, that Linus and Cletus had governed the Roman Church during the lifetime of the Apostles, and that Clement had been ordained by Peter himself as his successor. A fresco discovered in S. Clemente by F. Mullooly represents this circumstance, and S. Clement is there seated in the Apostles' Chair with Linus and Cletus on either side. Tertullian had lived in Rome before the close of the second century, when men were still living who had conversed with the contemporaries of the Apostles.

These are the principal testimonies to the authenticity of S. Peter's Chair, but they require the luminous comments of the Cav. De Rossi to give an adequate idea of their force. Our readers must consult the *Bulletino* for themselves, if they would learn what the author has to say about the two Feasts of S. Peter's Chair, and other matters connected with this interesting subject. We trust, however, that we have said enough to make the pilgrim to Rome kneel with greater veneration before the Altar where this Relic is preserved; and, when he sees the Sovereign Pontiff carried in procession, he will remember that the first Christian Senator of Rome could think of

no fitter mode of honouring the Prince of the Apostles than by giving him a *sella gestatoria*, such as he himself had in the time of Claudius only just been permitted to use ; and that with this gift of Pudens has been connected, for 1,800 years, the crowd of precious associations which bind every Catholic heart to the Chair of S. Peter.

---

*The Seven Weeks' War: its Antecedents and its Incidents.* By H. M. HOZIER, F.C.S., F.G.S. London : Macmillan & Co.

THIS book bears evident marks of haste ; the haste incidental to its original composition, but also of haste in its subsequent revision and expansion. Nevertheless, it is the most remarkable contribution to English military literature of the historical kind, since Sir William Napier's great book on the Peninsular war.

Mr. Hozier was special correspondent of the *Times* with the army of Prince Frederick Charles, during the late war ; and the readers of that journal at the time will remember with what a comprehensive view he described all the operations of the Prussian army, and their bearings one on the other—with what instinctive recognition of their genius and energy he displayed the unfolding of the plans of its generals, and how graphically he realised, in his marvellous descriptions of the first fierce skirmishes between the two armies, the irresistible, deadly effect of the then hardly-known needle-gun. There is nothing in all Napier's writing more truly and powerfully picturesque than Mr. Hozier's rapid sketches of some of those actions, such as Podoll and Gitschin. The description of the great battle itself, largely elaborated in the present edition, and splendidly illustrated, will always be quoted as one of the most accurate and complete authorities upon certain of its aspects. Of course, as Mr. Hozier accompanied the staff of Prince Frederick Charles, that side of the battle in which his divisions took a part was the side which fell under his more immediate observation, and the description of the Crown Prince's operations wants the vividness of view, and probably the accuracy of detail, which we find in regard to the operations from Kammenitz to Sadowa. And of course, also, it was impossible for him to obtain the materials wherewith to prepare such an account as he would doubtless have desired to give, of the strategy and tactics of the Austrians. Mr. Hozier has, however, evidently done his utmost to make his history as complete as possible upon these points. But much that is necessary to the full elucidation and illustration of the war remains, and may perhaps long remain, unpublished, especially on the Austrian side. It is to be hoped that before his second edition, some of these materials may reach Mr. Hozier, so as to make in every way complete a work, which will certainly take its place as a standard authority on one of the most interesting chapters of modern history.

\*.\* Unavoidable circumstances have, to our regret, much curtailed our short notices of this quarter. We particularly lament that we must postpone until our next number our comments on the very important second volume of "Academic Essays" which has recently appeared. We would also mention that we have not forgotten our expressed intention of criticising at greater length the series called "Tracts for the Day."

WE must also postpone to our next number all remarks on a very remarkable pamphlet, "The Theories of Copernicus and Ptolemy, by a Wrangler" (London, Longmans), which has just appeared. On grounds exclusively scientific, the author reopens this whole question, and maintains that Copernicanism has not even scientific probability on its side.

---

# INDEX.

---

ADDRESS (Episcopal) presented to the Holy Father, at Rome, July, 1867, *noticed*, 528.

Allies (T. W.), Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church, *reviewed*, 1.

AN IRISH SESSION, 512–527 : Mr. Bright's parliamentary remedy for Irish discontent, 512 : Lord Russell's antecedents, and his newly awakened desire for the abolition of the Established Church, 513, 514 ; the Whigs and their defection from what they once pronounced the abiding policy of their party, 515 ; what do the Catholics of Ireland consider their principal grievance ? 516 ; review of Mr. Aubrey de Vere's scheme for the cure of Irish disaffection, 517 ; deplorable results of the factious opposition of the Irish Liberal Members to the Government, 518 ; proposed plans for the settlement of the land question—measures put forward by Lord Mayo, 519, 520 ; opportuneness of legislation on the subject, 522 ; Government and the granting of a charter to the Catholic University, 523 ; the duty of Catholics giving a fair trial to the present Ministry, 524 ; servile relation of Irish Catholic representatives to the Liberal party, 525 ; the extent to which Ireland may profit by a Reform Bill, 526 ; eminent Irishmen excluded by apathy or ingratitude from public life, 527.

Author (the) of the Three Chancellors, Christian Schools and Scholars, *noticed*, 217.

BOUGAUD (l'Abbé), Histoire de Sainte Chantal, *reviewed*, 125.

CENTENARY (THE) OF 1867, 472–482 : Canonization of twenty-five saints 472 ; extraordinary attendance of bishops, 473 ; picture of Rome on the eve of the celebration, 474 ; magnificence of the interior of S. Peter's, 475 ; description of the entrance of the Holy Father and of the procession, 476 ; the process of canonization described, 477, 478 ; the Pope's sermon, 479–481 ; the æsthetic side of the ceremony, 482.

CHANTAL (S. JANE F. DE), 125–154 : The Bishop of Orleans on biographies of Saints, 125 ; character of S. Jane's father, 127–131 ; her marriage, 132 ; her first miracle, 133 ; her husband's death, 134 ; meeting with S. Francis de Sales, 136–139 ; the rule of the visitation, 140 ; S. Jane's spirit, 141–144 ; her children, 144–146 ; her friendship with S. Francis, 146–148 ; her long suffering and death, 149 ; vision of S. Vincent de Paul, 150 ; the Order of the Visitation, 151–154.



Charge of the Lord Chief Justice of England to the Grand Jury at the Central Criminal Court, in the case of the Queen *v.* Nelson and Brand, *noticed*, 241.

*Civiltà Cattolica*, *noticed*, 208–210.

Classics (Heathen), Letter from the Holy Office, *noticed*, 533.

DAY (Tracts for the), *noticed*, 239.

De l'Épinois (M.), Review of Historical Questions, *noticed*, 535.

De Roskovány (Augustino), *Romanus Pontifex tanquam Primas*, *noticed*, 537.

De Rossi (G. B.), *Bulletino di Archeologia Cristiana*, *noticed*, 539.

Dufferin (Lord), Irish Emigration, *reviewed*, 200.

Döllinger (J. J. T. von), *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, *reviewed*, 80.

ENGLISH CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY EDUCATION, 381–440 : Meaning of education in the apprehension of human weakness, 381 ; divorce between the education of the intellect and of the will, and the debasement of the parties so separated, 382 ; inability of heretical creeds to arrest the gravitation of modern civilization towards old pagan forms and superstitions, 383 ; vital necessity of union between faith and secular education in every stage of life, 383 ; danger of withdrawing educational institutes from the moderating power and authority of the Church, 384 ; progress of education from the primitive Christian age to the Council of Trent—its evolutions and developments, 385 ; influence of woman on the culture of brothers and husbands, 386 ; SSS. Marcella, Paula, and Olympia, 388 ; religious foundations which owe their existence to female piety in England, 389 ; religious change in England during the past fifty years, 390 ; the tendency of modern society, and “the positive doctrines of religion,” 391 ; compromise between the Church and the world impossible, 392 ; mission of the Church in the common progress and conflicts of the world, 393 ; classes of Catholics who are fascinated by the prospects of an Oxford education, 394 ; responsibilities and duties of the Catholic aristocracy, 395 ; the importance of the preservation of the sense of duty in religious and secular matters, 396, 397 ; how have the Catholics of the United Kingdom discharged their duties in connection with their proper relations to the State ? 399 ; do our Catholic nobility and gentry really suffer in the contests of the world from a lack of immediate education ? 401 ; culture—its benefits and its attendant dangers considered, 403 ; the experience of the Church for ages justifies her in refusing to countenance “godless education,” 404 ; true character of the sort of culture most prized at Oxford and Cambridge, 406 ; University doctrine of caste, 408 ; eminent public men who have not been brought up at either University, 412 ; why the Universities help to foster mediocrity, 414, 415 ; why the influence of Ushaw, Oscott, and Stonyhurst tends to the opposite, 416, 417 ; religious aspects of University life and teaching, 418, 419 ; phenomena of philosophical study at Oxford, 420–422 ; latitudinarian- and rationalism infest the entire University system, 423 ; contamina-

tion of morals through laxity of superintendence, and increasing decline of discipline, 424–426 ; difference in tone and principle between Catholic and non-Catholic homes, 247 ; objections to Catholics seeking education in Protestant Universities classified and examined, 428–430 ; S. Gregory upon the ordinary perils of University life, 430, 431 ; sacrifices which Catholics are bound to make for the intellectual advancement of those who ought to be their leaders in the conflict with the heresies and prejudices of the day, 433, 434 ; dangers of false philosophy, and rudimentary ignorance of Catholic truth considered, 434, 435 ; that the peril of such evils cannot be exaggerated, 436 ; Catholic educational statistics, 437 ; the prospects of obtaining a charter for an English Catholic University, 438 ; the advantages which such an institution would confer 439 ; reparation of the bad work done by the Reformers, 440.

Exeter Hall (a Few Hints to), *noticed*, 237.

FABER (Frederick William), Devotion to the Pope, *noticed*, 230.

Ffoulkes (Edmund S.), Christendom's Divisions, Part II., *noticed*, 221.

————— ——— Protest against review of his book on Christendom's Divisions, 246.

FIRST (THE) AND THE SECOND MAN, 441–471 : Review of polytheistic idolatries, 441, 442 ; the state of original justice, 442 ; the great dignity of Adam, and the proportionate consequence of his fall, 444 ; relations between the Creator and the creature considered, 446, 447 ; the divine covenant between Adam and the human race, 448, 449 ; observance of the covenant through the continuity of the patriarchs, 450 ; counterpart of Adam in the new dispensation, 451 ; connection between the first man and his race and between Christ's mystical headship of His people drawn out, 452 ; purpose of the Incarnation examined, 453 ; it was to create instead of the kingdom of Darkness a kingdom of Light and Truth, 454, 455 ; the bearing of Daniel's prophecy upon the new dispensation, 456 ; economy of the human machine—its physical form and intellectual faculties, 458 ; the mystical Body of Christ in its relationship to the body of His Body, the Church, 459 ; the symbolism of Kingdom, Temple, Spouse—Body signifying one distinct and unalterable meaning, 461 ; perfect unity of the Church under all types and forms, 462 ; the head and the body make one Christ, 463 ; the office of the Holy Ghost in the life and mission of the Church—S. Augustine's comments, 464–466 ; the Donatist pretension examined, 467, 468 ; impossible that truth can cease to be perpetuated in the Church, 469 ; the work which Catholicism has done for the general interests of humanity, 470, 471.

GODS (the) OF THE NATIONS WHEN CHRIST APPEARED, 80–109 : Gradual growth of the Roman Unity, 80 ; the ten idolatries of the Empire, 81 ; the Jewish worship, 86 ; Polytheism in private and social life, 87–89 ; its moral influence, 89–93 ; Polytheism throughout a corruption, 93 ; its relation to the fallen angels, 94–98 ; its supernatural effects, 98–100 ;

Paganism in the Roman civilization and polity, 101-104 ; human society in reference to the Polytheism of the Empire, 104, 105 ; appearance of Christ, 106-108 ; the First and the Second Man, 108, 109.

Gröne (V. von), Tetzels und Luther, *reviewed*, 35.

HAHN-HAHN (Countess), Lives of the Fathers of the Desert, *noticed*, 231.

Hefele (C. J.), Der Cardinal Ximenes, *reviewed*, 163.

Hettinger (Von Franz), Apologie des Christenthums, *noticed*, 234.

Hoey (Cashel), Speeches of Lord Plunket, *reviewed*, 48.

HOLY SEE (THE) AND THE SPANISH INQUISITION, 163-200 : January article on the Inquisition, 163 ; condition of Spain at the close of the fifteenth century, 164-168 ; first impulse to establishment of the Spanish Inquisition, 169-170 ; the Pope deceived as to the King's intentions, 171, 172 ; he consequently issues a Brief censuring cruelties, 173, 174 ; the King pretends submission, 175 ; organization of tribunal, 176 ; Rome makes unavailing attempts to mitigate the rigour of the Spanish Inquisition, 178 ; measures against the Jews, 179-181 ; Ferdinand and Isabella's dealing with the Moors, 182-186 ; Ximenes becomes Grand Inquisitor of Castile and Leon, 187 ; his severity towards the functionaries of the Inquisition, 188 ; except under Ximenes, the aim of the Inquisition was to lessen the influence of Rome in Spain, 190.

Hozier (H. M.), The Seven Weeks' War, *noticed*, 543.

IRISH QUESTIONS, 200-207 : Present state of Ireland, 200 ; conduct of the Irish Members, 201 ; proper policy to abolish Fenianism, 202-204 ; English opinion on land question, 204 ; Lord Dufferin's opinions, 205 ; the Government measure of Land Tenure, 206.

KNOX (Thomas Francis, of the Oratory), When does the Church speak Infallibly ? or, the Nature and Sphere of the Church's Teaching Office, *noticed*, 213.

MANNING (Archbishop), England and Christendom, *reviewed*, 110.

MANNING (ARCHBISHOP) ON ENGLAND AND CHRISTENDOM, 110-125 : Anglicans' feeling towards the Archbishop, 110-112 ; his doctrine on Infallibility, 112 ; subject of his present volume, 113 ; Convocation, 114-116 ; the principles of the Reformation, 116, 117 ; the Holy Spirit in the Church of England, 118-120 ; Unionism and Latitudinarianism, 121-123 ; historical view of the Church of England, 123-125.

MINOR DOCTRINAL JUDGMENTS, 333-381 : Alleged exaggerated theories asserted to have been put forward by the DUBLIN REVIEW, their scope and meaning defined, 333-335 ; review of the eighty propositions condemned in the Encyclical and Syllabus, 336, 337 ; interior belief in the infallibility of ex cathedrâ pronouncements of the Pope, essential to salvation, 337 ; the Church infallible in minor censures, 339 ; the definition of what the Church calls and considers internal assent to her teachings, 340 ; obvious deductions from the Bull "Unigenitus," 343 ; F. Ryder's position with regard to the question of the Pope's infallibility

examined, 344 ; theological testimony as to the extent to which the Church claims implicit obedience to her teachings, and when she does not, 344, 345 ; the truth or untruth of condemned propositions upon which the judgment of the Church stands reserved, 347 ; difference between irreformable judgments and minor censures, 347, 348 ; scope of the Church's prerogative, 353 ; the continual presence of the Holy Ghost in all the actions and relations of the Church, 353 ; infallibility of the Church outside the Deposit actual or virtual, 354 ; parallelism between ancient and modern Papal decrees, 356 ; relations of Catholicism to the evolutions of human reason in search of scientific truths, 357 ; the condemnation of Günther by Pius IX., and its consequences, 359 ; the work which the Church effects for the faithful, and the guarantees that it shall be pursued to the end, 359-361 ; use and necessity of the sound form of words, 363 ; the question of mortal sin, 369 ; a contemporary on a passage in the *Quantà curâ*, 375.

M. (J. B.), Letter on the Heroism of our Blessed Lady, *noticed*, 250.

Murray (P.), *Tractatus de Ecclesiâ*, *reviewed*, 1.

PLUNKET'S (LORD) LIFE AND SPEECHES, 48-80 : General character of Mr. Plunket's work, 48 ; sketch of Lord Plunket's life, 49-52 ; character of the Irish Parliament, 52-54 ; Plunket in College and in Parliament, 55-58 : the Union, 58-61 ; the Emmett trial, 62 ; speeches on the Catholic Question, 64 ; Lord Brougham's criticism on Plunket's oratory, 65 ; the Irish Chancellorship, 66-68 ; consistency of Plunket's character, 69-71 ; the Catholics and the Union, 71-74 ; Catholic agitation, 74-76 ; Plunket's religious views, 76 : his views of the Catholic religion, 79.

Plunket (the Hon. David), *Life, Letters, and Speeches of Lord Plunket*, *reviewed*, 48.

PUSEY (DR.) ON PAPAL PREROGATIVES, 1-34 : Amazing insensibility of Anglicans to argument for Papal prerogatives, 1 ; connection of the two questions of Papal prerogative and Ecclesiastical unity, 1-3 ; direct proof of the former doctrine, 3-5 ; Dr. Pusey's errors regarding the Church's teaching and governing office, 5 ; rule of faith in the Apostolic and early ages, 5-9 ; Church government by a majority considered, 9, 10 ; the Gallican doctrine of authority considered, 11-13 ; the Ultramontane doctrine, 13-15 ; this doctrine considered in reference to Scripture, 15-18 ; to the Apostolic history, 18-21 ; in the ante-Nicene period, 21-27 ; in the post-Nicene period, 27-29 ; Dr. Pusey's historical objections considered, 29-32 ; his patristic objections, 32, 33 ; subject of concluding article, 34.

PUSEY (DR.) ON THE SYLLABUS, 280-301 : *Résumé* of preceding articles on Dr. Pusey, 280 ; the insignificance of his objections to the prerogatives claimed for the Church—anti-Roman difficulties, 281 ; Dr. Pusey did not attack Pius IX., but the DUBLIN REVIEW, 282 ; his first main proposition on the extent of infallibility claimed by Pius IX., 283 ; the doctrine of the *Quantà curâ*, 284 ; the alleged despotism of faith, 285 ; marks of an *ex cathedrâ* utterance, 289 ; the Pope in his capacity of

Universal Teacher, 290 ; distinction made between teachings which are *ex cathedrâ* and teachings which are not—does Pius IX. extend infallibility more widely than Bellarmine ? 291 ; controversies between the Latin and Greek communions, 293 ; Dr. Pusey, on certain historical objections to the Syllabus, 294 ; critical analysis of the main points of the Eirenicon, 296 ; defence of the Bull “*Ineffabilis*,” 299 ; Dr. Pusey’s strange complaint on the large number of utterances for which infallibility is claimed, 300, 301.

Pusey (E. B.), *An Eirenicon*, *reviewed*, 1.

RIESS (Florian von, S.J.), *Encyclical of Pius IX. of December, 1864*, *noticed*, 210.

RYDER (F.) AND DR. WARD, 155–162 : Importance of the question at issue, 155 ; extent of F. Ryder’s theory, 156 ; Dr. Ward’s argument, as to the Church’s infallibility in minor censures, 157–159 ; the question of conciliating Protestants, 160 ; points reserved for future consideration, 161.

RYDER’S (F.) THEOLOGICAL CITATIONS, 483–512 : Statement of the point at issue between F. Ryder and the DUBLIN REVIEW, 483 ; infallibility of the Church in minor censures, 484 ; opinions of S. Alphonsus on the question, 485 ; improbability of a number of theologians having implied what none of their number ever declared, 486 ; Pope Nicholas I. and the Sacrament of Baptism—his reply to the Bulgarians explained on the authority of Suarez, 447, 448 ; F. Ryder’s alleged testimonies from Suarez, the Salmanticenses, Tanner, the Acts of Ratisbon, Bolgeni, Stapleton, Driedo, 489–494 ; when does the Pope speak *ex cathedrâ*, and when does he not ? 494 ; presumed restriction of the object-matter of infallibility to definitions of faith, 495 ; scope and meaning of infallibility, 497, 498 ; analysis of Ballerini’s language on the subject, and the extent to which it has been misunderstood, 499, 500 ; distinction between definitions of faith and minor doctrinal judgments, 500, 501 ; the texts by which F. Ryder maintains that Catholics may ascertain when the Pope does or does not speak *ex cathedrâ*, 503 ; the *rationale* of these texts drawn out, 504–506 ; what Cappellari meant in the treatise upon which F. Ryder relies so much, 507, 508 ; the Pope not to be corrected by theologians, but theologians to be corrected by the Pope, 508 ; F. Perrone on the extent of infallibility in the Church, 509, 510.

Ryder (H. L. D.), *Idealism in Theology*, *reviewed*, 154.

S. ALOYSIUS GONZAGA (THE LIFE OF), 301–333 : The many-sided nature of sanctity, 301 ; especial functions in the religious life, 302 ; the relation of the saints to the communication and operation of grace, 303 ; the diversity and harmony of supernatural gifts, 305 ; the beautiful humility of S. Aloysius, 307 ; “the unreasonableness” of the saints explained and justified, 308 ; enmities of the devil towards prayers and contemplation—the saint’s confidence in the love of God, 309 ; the root of his sanctity lying in profound resignation, 311 ; the philosophy of the love of self-mortification, 312 ; the saint’s perfect accordance with God’s will, 313 ;

